

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11-5 a.m. on Wednesday the 22nd day of March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

With reference to the answers to questions Nos. 64 and 1247 given at the meetings of the Legislative Council held on the 1st August 1921 and the 14th February 1922, respectively, the Secretary laid on the table G.O. No. 359, Revenue, dated 23rd February 1922.

II

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND XIII—POLICE.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, I rise to move a demand for a grant not exceeding Rs. 148.12 lakhs on behalf of the Police Department. The manner in which that figure has been arrived at is indicated at page 8 of the list of demands, but before we actually come to the discussion of the motions on the agenda, I should like, Sir, with your permission, to pay a tribute to the great services which the officers and the men of the Police Department have rendered to the presidency of Madras during the past exceedingly troublous year. There is no need, Sir, to give detailed reasons for this public commendation; for, I think, every one in this House is well aware of the magnificent service done."

Motion 465.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

465. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 500.*

Motion 466.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—" Before I make the motion standing against my name, I want to know from the hon. the Home Member what is meant by this duty allowance."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" The details of the allowances in issue are Rs. 100 per mensem to the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Madras City, and two allowances of Rs. 50 each for the two Assistant Commissioners. The case for these allowances depends on the additional responsibilities of the posts which these gentlemen hold and the higher cost of living in the Presidency town."

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—" Sir, I do not make the following motion :—

466. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,400 for duty allowance."*

The motion was not made.

Motion 467.

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—" Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

467. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 89,286 for provision made on account of additional police.*

[Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu] [22nd March 1922]

"I find, Sir, that in the budget at page 108 a sum of Rs. 89,286 has been provided for additional police in the Madras City which is made up of four sergeants, four head constables and 312 constables. I find in the note prepared by the Finance Secretary at page 48—

'The scheme for the additional police for the Madras City—item (2) above—involves the addition to the police force of four sergeants, four head constables and 312 constables, which is necessary to restore the strength to that fixed by the Police Commission in 1905. This replacement of men whose services have been dispensed with in order to provide for increasing the pay of the rest has been decided upon as a result of enquiries instituted at the instance of the Madras Disturbances Committee which drew the pointed attention of the Government to the inadequacy of the strength of the City Police.'

"There is no doubt that during the last year a situation has been created due to the labour dispute; I concede that. But I submit that simply because there was an unusual disturbance and an unusual pressure brought about partly by non-co-operation and so forth, it is not certainly correct that we should increase the police force by some Rs. 89,000. It is quite possible that if circumstances similar to this should occur in the future we have got the military stationed in the metropolis and that should be quite sufficient to cope with any such situation. If at all there is a necessity to keep a force for any such emergency, we can very well indent upon the police of the adjoining districts to help the Madras police. In a slender year like this when we have a deficit of over a crore, I think it is not a wise policy to increase the police force by Rs. 89,000 a year. I know that the hon. the Home Member at the time he introduced the budget of the Police Department, gave a compliment to the Police and I join with him in the compliment. They have done exemplary work. But that cannot be a ground for increasing the expenditure on police to that extent. I submit, Sir, that the Madras police alone costs 12·54 lakhs and the district executive police for the whole presidency comes to 135 lakhs. When this is divided among the 24 districts, we get less than 6 lakhs for each district, while Madras City alone wants more than 12 lakhs. This is a large figure, and I hope the hon. the Home Member will see his way to cut down the budget figure."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I beg to support the motion.

11-15 a.m.

We see from the financial note, if I understood it correctly, that the very same increased establishment was there before and it was cut down for the purpose of increasing the pay of the remaining establishment. Well, Sir, having done that and having taken credit, probably as on several other occasions that they were able to reduce the establishment so far as the police is concerned—and they have taken the credit throughout the year practically,—now to come and say that it should be increased again is rather surprising. The only reason so far as we can understand from the note is that this is done because the committee that was appointed to investigate into the matter of labour troubles in the city of Madras has in a way led to it. So far as the labour troubles were concerned, there were two versions. One version was the version of the official committee and the only effect of that committee was to add to the burden of the tax-payer. The committee made several recommendations and we do not see much has been done so far as the other recommendations are concerned, and the only thing that has been done is to add Rs. 90,000 to the budget expenditure.

"The other version at the time was that the labour disputes had their origin not necessarily on account of political reasons but on account of

22nd March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

economic labour problems. It was incensed very much not for want of police, but on account of the police inefficiency and the unsatisfactory work of the Labour Department. The non-official committee, though not appointed by Government, consisted of some influential and leading gentlemen including three members of this Council and they made the suggestion, as it were, that the whole thing was not due to the want of sufficient police strength.

"I am afraid, Sir, Government sometimes want bricks to be made and they want to have, according to the old proverb, plenty of straw for making those bricks. We have no objection to sanction the straw, but very often it happens that the straw becomes useless when they want too much of it and sometimes some of it is rotten also, so that by having too much straw and some being rotten also, the whole thing emits bad odour. According to the non-official committee's report the trouble was due more to the inefficiency of the police and also to the trouble given by the Labour Department. All that I would say is that we have a number of troubles due to non-co-operation, labour, etc., throughout the year and practically every district will claim something to its credit. If in every district for some trouble or other this dictum of having additional police is had recourse to, I am afraid we will have to double or probably treble the police and everywhere there will be only police and no other officer. So far as the Madras City is concerned, we believe that the labour troubles are over and let us expect the present Labour Department, if it is continued, will work towards more efficiency and greater usefulness. But there is absolutely no necessity for this additional police. As for non-co-operation, the Government claim the credit of having put many of the leaders into prison and at least, so far as the intentions of the Government have been expressed, they have no idea of letting any of these out. In that case I do not see any reason why the police should be increased in Madras or elsewhere. The cost of the police has unfortunately gone up very much and I do not think it is necessary to add to it. As has been very well stated, Madras has got very strong and efficient police and we have got a large number of volunteers. Also we have got some soldiers here, and there is His Excellency's bodyguard which did so much useful work, according to the Government, in the Northern Circars recently, and there are several district headquarters from which police can be easily brought into the Madras City on a few hours' notice. In all these circumstances, it is absolutely unnecessary to have additional police stationed in Madras City in anticipation of abnormal circumstances as the labour disturbances of last year. Why should we anticipate abnormal troubles just as being afraid of occasional sickness which may or may not happen? I am most interested in this as one coming from the mufassal, because this will create a precedent, and wherever there is any disturbance at any time, either labour trouble, or any other trouble, there would be reason for increasing the police in every place. From that point of view, I think this additional police is absolutely unnecessary. But if the members from Madras and my other friends think that their original view about these labour disturbances is wrong and that it should be changed, and if they think that for the safety of this city more police are necessary, we from the mufassal will not be against it. But our fear will be that it will be creating a bad precedent for asking for additional police in every place where there may be some disturbance, real or imaginary, occasional or frequent."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I am not for reducing the police grant even by a single pie at this juncture. We want to increase the

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [22nd March 1922]

efficiency of the police in Madras both by quantity and quality. They have cut down the number of police constables and others and they have suffered the consequences. Now, we should try our best to see that the police force is increased as much as possible and Madras is made self-sufficient without waiting for forces from outside."

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI:—"We are trying to cut down the expenditure on police. It is the same as withdrawing protection when danger comes. Our friend, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, says that there is no necessity for this additional police and that we can get police from outside. It is the same as going to dig a well for water when the house is on fire. We must be prepared previously for all troubles. We must anticipate danger. We cannot say that our country is settled peacefully and that for a long time we do not want police. It may be that it has subsided for a short period and for a long time to come we must have efficient police to prevent such sort of things according to the proverb 'Prevention is better than cure'. If we are already prepared, our enemies will not give much trouble, and if there is danger it can be put down in no time. We must have efficient police to protect our safety and liberty. If the door is open, it is an invitation to the thief; if it is closed, it is a prevention. With these few words, I oppose the motion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I will begin my remarks in reply by stating that it is hardly possible, within the short limit of time allotted, to set out all the reasons which have necessitated this proposal for additions to the City Police in Madras. A detailed note on the subject was prepared for the information of the Finance Committee and laid before them—I do not know exactly when, but some time during the past few weeks—and I understand that the Finance Committee on a scrutiny of the details recognized that the proposals were a bare necessity. It has been assumed that they arise solely out of the labour disturbances last year. That is not the case. The necessity for additions to the City Police first made itself apparent during the serious looting disturbances of 1918. Since then, we have had a great deal more practical experience which has demonstrated beyond all possibility of doubt that the reduction in the strength of the City Police which was given effect to during the war was ill-advised. I do not say, Sir, that it was not a necessary measure at the time and in the circumstances, for a compelling factor was that it was found exceedingly difficult to recruit men for the City Police, and the Commissioner, Mr. Armitage, thought it better to have a smaller number of men on somewhat better pay than a nominally larger sanctioned strength up to which he was actually unable to recruit owing to lack of sufficient inducements for enlistment. That was an experiment which in the peculiar circumstances of the war it was quite right to try. But the experiment has been tried and it has failed, and the result is that we have now to restore the ordinary divisional strength of the City Police which has been proved to be a necessity. One of the reasons leading to that conclusion is the undoubted increase of grave crime; that is because there has not been an adequate number of police to perform the requisite patrol duties and prevent crime and lawlessness. The prevention of grave crime is only one aspect of the case.

"Another aspect is the necessity for a stronger armed reserve. The events of last year and of September 1918 proved that the existing armed

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

reserve police was inadequate. It has been suggested that this is not a sufficient ground for increasing its strength and that we can indent on the military forces in reserve and on men from the reserves of neighbouring mufassal districts when temporary circumstances necessitate strengthening. Now, in regard to reliance on military force, I ought to tell the House that there is no item of policy in the Military Department which has been more forcibly and more frequently impressed on the Local Governments than that they must make their own arrangements for the ordinary maintenance of peace and order and must not get into the habit of relying upon military forces to perform the duties of the police or to strengthen the police in times of emergency, unless the emergency is of the very gravest nature. Such an emergency did arise last year in this city, and in order to meet it we had immediately to raise a special force of upwards of 200 men the cost of which was in the first instance to have been levied from the locality where they were employed. That burden has, as I believe the House are aware, since been removed with the result that the general taxpayer meets the cost of measures necessitated by the disturbed condition of a small area. Not only was that temporary addition made to the staff of the city police—an addition which we now find it necessary to make permanent—but also some 300 constables from mufassal reserves were brought in as a measure of further assistance, and this at a time when it was very difficult and sometimes positively dangerous to reduce the strength of district reserves. It was a matter of constant anxiety to the Inspector-General of Police and myself to judge and decide whether it was safe to allow reserves to be brought in from particular districts or to remain longer in the city of Madras, and whether the needs of Madras or the needs of other districts were greater. We had to arrange from time to time a number of reliefs, sometimes because of the circumstances in the mufassal districts from which the additional police had been brought into Madras and sometimes for other reasons. In addition to these methods of strengthening the police force of the city of Madras, we had for a long time regular soldiers quartered in parts of the disturbed area. On one occasion, a regiment in transit from Jubbulpore to Wellington, most fortunately in transit at a critical time, was diverted by telegram to the city of Madras and brought in just when it was most urgently required.

“On another occasion, Sir, the Auxiliary Forces, to which Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar gave the old nomenclature of ‘volunteers,’ were requisitioned. This happened not only on one but on several occasions. The men were standing by for any emergency that might arise. These, Sir, are illustrations of the impossibility to guarantee peace and order in the city of Madras without substantial additions to the police force. Mr. Somasundaram Pillai has told us that prevention is better than cure. That is a maxim which is emphatically applicable to this case and I should not be discharging my duty to the Government and to the people if I did not give effect to it by taking steps to place the city police in a position to prevent rather than to quell disorder.

“I cannot, Sir, in the short time available attempt to traverse the criticisms that have been passed on the causes or the supposed causes of the labour disturbances in the city of Madras or discuss the findings of the Committee which sat under the presidency of Sir William Ayling and its recommendations. But this I will say that, after very careful consideration, the

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

Government of Madras have no doubt whatsoever as to the compelling necessity for adopting that recommendation which drew pointed attention to the inadequacy of the strength of the police force in the City. We have recently, Sir, had trouble which gave me much anxiety. I refer to the threatenings of a strike of the city police. I am well aware that the trouble was due to a variety of circumstances, very largely I expect, the incessant endeavours which have been made to seduce the police from their loyalty to the *Sirkar*. I am glad to say, Sir, that a stout resistance has usually been put up against endeavours of that description. But that was only one of the factors in issue. Another factor was the undoubted feeling of the city police that too much was expected of it. I have said that it was found necessary to raise their numbers in order to provide for a proper discharge of patrol and beat duties. Now in the memorials for addition to the emoluments of the city police, particular stress was laid on the very arduous nature of the duties imposed upon them and pointed attention was drawn to the fact that four men are now expected to do the duties which formerly devolved on five. That is another ground for addition to the city police, for it is well that we should have a contented body of men at the disposal of Government for the maintenance of law and order. I cannot myself say that the city police were not to some extent justified in asking for some addition to their emoluments—though not for any great addition. That ground of anxiety has now passed away and I hope this House will not risk reviving it by insisting upon the reduction in strength proposed on this motion."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, this is an item that concerns primarily the Madras city and two hon. Members of this House who are supposed to know more the requirements of the city than most of us are in favour of the grant being allowed. In view of that, I do not think the House will be justified in not respecting their feelings and in going against their wishes. So far as the mufassal districts are concerned, we come from a distance and what we have heard and have reason to believe might or might not be true. We have here the testimony of two members of the city as to the necessity for the provision and in that view of the matter, I earnestly request my hon. Friend, Mr. Suryanarayana, not to press his motion."

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU:—"Sir, the question, as my friend, Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar said, is one that relates to the city of Madras in the first instance although of course it has something to do with the public in so far as the general tax-payer will have to pay for it. But, if I correctly heard the hon. the Home Member, in the closing remarks, I heard him say that the demand by the existing police for an increase of their salary was causing him some anxiety. If that was so, I think that ought to be just the reason why we should not add to the police force any more."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, I gather that the hon. Member did not hear all that I said. What I said was that the unrest among the city police was to some extent attributable to the fact that an unduly large volume of work was imposed upon an inadequate number of policemen. That was one of the factors that constituted a reason for adding to the strength of the police in order that we might be able to tell them that they would not in future be expected to discharge so heavy a burden of duty as previously devolved on them."

22nd March 1922]

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU:—"Anyhow, Sir, as my hon. Friend Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar has said, since the question is one which relates to the city of Madras and since the two hon. Members from the city have expressed their opinion that the additional police will be necessary, I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 468 to 471.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

468. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 89,286 for additional police.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

469. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 36,744 for constables by Rs. 7,500.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

470. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 11,94,221 for Presidency police by Rs. 50,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

471. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,53,140 for establishment of Inspector-General of Police by Rs. 1,000.*

Motion 472.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

472. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 11,630 for establishments of Deputy Inspectors-General.*

"In this resolution, Sir, it is not my view to cut down the establishment so much as to ascertain the view of the Government so far as the deputy inspectors-general are concerned. All the four appointments given under this head are non-votable and therefore I have put in this motion for a reduction of the whole of the establishment of the deputy inspectors-general just to ascertain the view of the Government whether they think that all these four appointments are absolutely necessary."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"May I rise for a ruling on the point of order whether it is permissible to argue the merits of the appointments of deputy inspectors-general, who are non-voted officers, on the grant item referring to their establishments. We had, as a matter of fact, a regular resolution on a matter of general public interest dealing with the issue of the necessity for these posts, but that resolution has lapsed. I gather from what the hon. Mover has just said that it is his desire to elicit information and to invite discussion on the need for the posts of deputy inspector-general of police."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The appointments of deputy inspectors-general of police are non-votable, but the hon. Member, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar's view seems to be to cut off their establishments and leave them without any office staff."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"I would just say one word, Sir. Unless any information is forthcoming on the point, we for ourselves would try

[Mr. Biswanath Das]

[22nd March 1922]

to cut off the establishment and thus express our protest. That is the reason why we should request you to allow us some breadth of discussion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member has, unintentionally of course, been most irregular in interrupting me. The hon. Member, Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar's point is that he considers the whole thing unnecessary, the deputy inspectors-general and their establishments. It is not only a question of a request for information, but the hon. Member wishes to omit that portion which is within his grasp leaving alone the other portion which he is, under the rules, debarred from attacking."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I thank you for your ruling, Sir. So far as these establishments are concerned I simply say, Sir, that we will be able to cut them down and if the House is satisfied of the absolute uselessness of these deputy inspectors-general, it can cut off their travelling allowance also along with the establishments. If the Government in their supreme wisdom refuse to act according to our wishes, by all means let them keep these persons under the punkah. We should at the outset see whether these officers are at all necessary. It has been found that so far as the city of Madras is concerned, we want additional police and probably that will be imitated in the mufassal and we may require additional police for the mufassal districts also. The last reference of the hon. the Home Member to the threatened police strike in Madras may also induce the Government to come to a decision that not only they should have a large force in Madras but also in other places also to get them to Madras if there was a threatened strike. That would mean we must have a large number of additional men everywhere with a view to minimise the evil effect of such strikes. All the credit that the Government have taken for taking away a number of constables and head constables will vanish into thin air very soon and I think we will be called upon to add to the police budget at a very early date. The attempt of the Council has been to try to cut down not the irreducible minimum but the minimum wherever it can be reduced and as the general discussion has showed it is necessary that the Government should try their best to reduce, if not altogether abolish, some of the so-called post office appointments. It does not mean, Sir, that we do not appreciate the post office itself, or say that the post office exists merely for the purpose of transferring letters but we suggest that these intermediate offices have got to justify a large expenditure and though they have got also some other work, it might very well be done by the officers just below or just above. The whole question, Sir, is this. Having a large number of efficient district superintendents of police both Imperial and Provincial and having at the head of the department a very able officer who is generally recruited from the department itself and above them all being the hon. the Home Member, is it necessary that we should have these four people just to supervise the whole department? It may be a necessary luxury at a time when we have got plenty of money but now at a time when we are on the verge of entering an insolvency court, we should see as to whether we cannot do without them. They may not be exactly luxuries but may be doubtful necessities but still we should see whether we can manage without them as every domestic difficulty may induce the house-owner to do. Many of us think that without in any way impairing or affecting the efficiency of the police force, without in any way affecting the safety of the people at large and also with a view to having the additional police that may be necessary

22nd March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

either in the Madras City or in the mufassal, it is desirable that some attempt should be made towards reduction. There are four divisions over which these four deputy inspectors-general preside and I ask the hon. the Home Member to say if the number cannot be reduced to two or three possibly by having more decentralization and giving some more powers to the superintendents and also to see whether there cannot be a reduction in their travelling allowances. My own opinion, Sir, is if we cannot entirely do away with these officers, we can at least reduce their number to two so that by the pay of these officers, by their establishments and by their travelling allowances, we will be able to have a large saving without in any way affecting the efficiency. It is in this view that I want the hon. the Home Member to consider the whole matter and say as to what the policy of the Government will be."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I have given notice of a motion to reduce the allotment for the police with a view to raise the same question, but it appears, by some mistake, in the agenda as the omission of the whole allotment. I do not know whether the mistake was due to my own office or to the Council office. My object in giving notice of that motion was to raise this same question. I should say at once, Sir, that when the Finance Committee was put to the necessity of finding ways of retrenchment, they thought that the one question which ought to be taken up and investigated was the question of the abolition of the intermediary officers between district officers and the central officers here in the headquarters. We thought that the necessity for these intermediary officers in all the departments must be considered, and I for one thought that if any one of these superior officers in any of the departments could be done away with, the first one that could easily go was the deputy inspector-general of police. The works that are now entrusted to the deputy inspector-general of police are, excepting the general supervision which every officer has to exercise, the transfer of officers between divisions, making the appointments to certain posts and the hearing of appeals. This is practically all the work that he is doing. It has been said that there has been a large increase in work in almost all departments. Very recently I had to talk to some of the heads of departments here in Madras in connexion with some motions of which I had given notice for abolition of offices in the departments of Education and the Public Works. I found that there was very much of centralization even in regard to small details. That seems to be the case in every department. Every detail regarding appointments of persons above Rs. 40 or Rs. 50, transfer of even small officers and even sanctioning very small works, have to go to the central office and much of the time of the head of the department is wasted in looking into these details instead of his time being really utilized in laying down matters of policy as it should be. So also in the case of the deputy inspector-general of police, a great deal of minor details is sent to him for orders which can very easily be entrusted to the district superintendent of police himself. In the Revenue Department where the work to be done is more complex and where the officer has very onerous responsibilities to discharge, it is not thought necessary to appoint intermediary officers between the Board of Revenue and the district collectors. But in other departments where the work cannot be said to be so complex or so responsible, intermediary officers are appointed to scrutinize the work of the officers and also, as I have mentioned, to sanction even small things. It seems to me that it is

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

[22nd March 1922]

quite unnecessary to have these intermediary officers when we have got highly paid and efficient men as district officers. Where big matters of policy are concerned, papers can be sent to the headquarters, and it is unnecessary to send small things for sanction to the head of the department. So, if this decentralization is given effect to and a great portion of the work sent from the district superintendent of police is stopped, then the only matters remaining will be the hearing of appeals and the transfer of high officers from one district to another. Such matters will have to come to the Inspector-General of Police and I think arrangements could be made in his office to get through the work. That seems to me to be a possible arrangement and if that arrangement is made, there will not be any necessity for the deputy inspector-general of police. I know that a great deal will be said by the persons concerned that these officers do not only the works for the disposal of which I have proposed arrangements, but they are also exercising a great deal of supervision. If in addition to the deputy inspector-general, we had another intermediary between him and the Inspector-General of Police and another officer between the district superintendent of police and the deputy inspector-general, we can advance the same argument. I do not think, Sir, that we should attach much weight to such arguments. There is the district superintendent of police who is in charge of the whole district and there is the Inspector-General here and the latter officer can very well be entrusted with the work of supervision instead of having an intermediary officer like the deputy inspector-general of police."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, I have given notice of a motion for the reduction of the allotment by Rs. 100, but I prefer to speak on this motion. The two members who spoke before me have given sufficient reasons for altogether doing away with all these officers. Turning to page 110 of the budget, hon. Members of this House will see what the sanctioned strength of the department is, but we are now immediately concerned with four of these appointments which will be found at the bottom of page 110. Adopting the various reasons so successfully put forward by the previous speakers, I should like to give one additional reason and that is that we should do this in order to mark our disapproval of the way in which these appointments are being made and of the utter absence of the Indian element in the cadre of these appointments. Now we have four deputy inspectors-general of police and one assistant inspector-general."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. I think the hon. Member will then be out of order; that is to say, if the hon. Member wants to knock off the establishment of the deputy inspectors-general on the ground that no Indian has been appointed to that cadre he will be out of order."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I just wanted to raise it only as a side issue, not that it has any direct bearing on the case."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Let us confine ourselves to the main issue."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"The only effective way of our giving effect to what is passing in our mind is to cut off the establishment altogether, thus making it impossible for these officers alone to continue."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, I take it that I need not deal with Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar's point as you have ruled it out of order. I referred, Sir, to this question of the deputy inspectors-general of Police when I was speaking during the general discussion of the budget. It is

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

an issue of very considerable importance and while I quite understand the desire of the gentlemen who are interested in the topic to raise a discussion on the subject during these budget debates, I would very earnestly deprecate any idea of pressing such discussion to the stage of bringing about any radical change in the constitution of the department. Any such change, Sir, ought only to be made after very careful consideration and after a discussion in which there is sufficient time to set out the arguments for and against the existing system. I mentioned during the general discussion of the budget that there had been proposals to cut out the police talaiyaris, the sub-inspectors, the inspectors, the deputy superintendents and the deputy inspectors-general of police and I also said that all those posts formed various parts of the edifice erected on the advice of a very experienced Commission, the Police Commission, which sat in India during 1902-1905, toured all over the country, took evidence from those who were best qualified to express opinions and finally submitted a very valuable report which has been the basis of the organization of the police forces throughout India ever since. Now, one of the items particularly strongly pressed by the Police Commission was this matter of deputy inspectors-general. They drew pointed attention to this. I may quote, from paragraph 70 of the report of the Police Commission, without fear of being called to order for reading passages which have not been laid on the table of this House or are not available to the members—

‘Passing now to the higher classes of inspecting officers, the Commission find that adequate advantage has not been taken of the provision of the law which permits the appointment of such deputy inspectors-general as to the Local Government shall seem fit. In all provinces these officers are too few in number. Some of their most important duties are entrusted to Commissioners and District Magistrates and many of them are entirely neglected. They are practically confined to work of a comparatively unimportant character; and their usefulness is consequently impaired. The Commission would, therefore, propose to increase their number and to place a deputy inspector-general in full administrative charge of a range comprising as many districts as he can reasonably be expected to control. This arrangement will not only lead to the maintenance of a higher standard of work among Superintendents, but also to their more cordial and intelligent co-operation with one another.’

“The report then goes on to say that a special deputy inspector-general is required for administrative charge of the Railway Police and possibly also of the Provincial Criminal Investigation Department, and it is laid down that ‘deputy inspectors-general should be carefully selected from among the superintendents.’

“Sir, every Local Government has, I think, paid due regard to the considered opinion of the Police Commission in this matter. It is no longer in accordance with the facts that they are practically confined to work of an unimportant character. That is not the case. A statement of their duties will be found in the Orders of the Madras Police, Chapter VIII, which deals with the powers and duties of superior officers. This also is a published book and I may read from it. Order No. 92 says—

‘The deputy inspector-general in charge of a range is a link in the chain of responsibility between the inspector-general and district officers. He should endeavour by frequent personal inspection to establish and maintain efficiency and discipline, to ensure uniformity of procedure and practice, and to secure co-operation between the police of his several districts as well as harmonious working between the police and the magistracy. He should control, instruct and advise superintendents, while being careful not to supersede them in any of their proper functions or relations to their subordinates.’

“The following order gives particulars of the very large measure of administrative control which the deputy inspector-general possesses with details of his functions in respect of transfers, appointments and the hearing of appeals.”

[22nd March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I should like to know whether the police orders are available to the public. As far as I knew I had considerable difficulty in getting it."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" The book is marked—

'Printed by the Superintendent, Government Press—Price 12 annas.'

"I have been particularly careful, Sir, not to quote from unpublished documents in view of your repeated rulings on the subject.

"I cannot subscribe to Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar's view that it is impossible to attach serious weight to the function of general supervision. On the contrary, it is a function of very greatest importance. To realise that it is only necessary to recall to the House that the police force in the Madras Presidency at the end of the year 1920 was upwards of 33,000 men. I am not quite certain of the present number, for there have been some reductions, but in any case the total figure is well over 30,000. The other day Mr. Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib, one of our members, tabled a resolution recommending the abolition of the deputy inspectors-general and a special note was prepared to enable me to deal with that resolution. I should have liked to make fuller use of that note than I can within the time now allotted to me. In the course of the examination of the functions of the deputy inspector-general of Police a reference was made to the present inspector-general, who has served as a deputy inspector-general and was once Commissioner of Police in the City of Madras, an officer to whose judgment I think most residents in the city attach considerable value. What Mr. Armitage told us was that the general public had not fully realised the amount of very important work done by these officers. He pointed out that there must be some one to enquire into the action taken by the district superintendent when objection is taken to matters arising between the district superintendent and other persons whether official or private. We have been told that there should be decentralization in the Police Department as elsewhere. I venture to ask if these very officers are not in a measure decentralising officers. Otherwise hundreds and hundreds of appeals would have to come up to the inspector-general of Police who cannot possibly spare the time for them. We have only too many instances in this House of the extent to which little matters of detail are brought to the notice of the Government and to the notice of the Legislative Council. The abolition of the post of deputy inspector-general would in reality be a measure of centralization rather than of decentralization. We have examined very fully the question of entrusting further powers to the district superintendents. This is an issue which has come before the Government again and again in my time. The only question is to what extent it is possible further to extend the functions of these officers. One main obstacle in the way of giving them fuller powers is the deep-rooted love of the people of the country for appeals, particularly in regard to instances of disciplinary action. Personally I have always thought that there should be some limitation, and I have on more than one occasion noted against the number of appeals, but my proposals were always disallowed by those responsible. That, Sir, is one reason why a deputy inspector-general is required to hear some of the appeals. Otherwise the order of the district superintendent would have to go on appeal to the inspector-general of Police who would have to be continually in his office reading these appeals and would not be able to do any inspection work. Nor

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

could he even without this appellate business possibly do the requisite amount of personal inspection throughout the presidency. He must have officers to assist him, for it is beyond question that the district superintendents of police require frequent inspection. I do not wish in any sense to suggest that the average district superintendent of police does not on the whole efficiently discharge his duties. But it is clearly necessary that there should be some one to advise him and point out where he is wrong and direct him as to the course he should pursue. My time must be up. I cannot therefore say anything more except repeat my appeal that discussions such as these in which the speeches are limited to five and ten minutes should not be utilised as a means of procuring radical changes in the organization of a great department, especially in the case of the department which is responsible for the maintenance of law and order. If I were deprived of the services of the deputy inspector-general, I could not guarantee such maintenance. And if any such measure is contemplated, it should form the subject of a separate resolution with provision for the fullest discussion."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, two questions have been raised in the course of this discussion : as to whether it is desirable to give larger powers to the district superintendents of police ; and as to whether it is necessary to continue the existing arrangement of the deputy inspector-general of police. Attention was drawn by the hon. the Home Member to the recommendations of the Police Commission, and it was pointed out that they recommended an increase in the number of deputy inspectors-general of police for effective supervision and inspection. But it must be remembered that they were dealing with an institution which was already in existence and they were perfectly right in suggesting that so long as the institution of the deputy inspectors-general remained, it was necessary to make them really useful. It is one thing to say that it is not desirable to have an intermediary officer like the deputy inspector-general of police, and another thing to say that if that officer were to remain there must be a circumscribed area for each officer for proper supervision over the work of the district superintendents of police. In the discussion which has taken place on this question attention has been drawn to the fact that in several of the departments wherein the work is equally important there is no intermediary officer corresponding to the deputy inspector-general of Police. For instance, in the case of the Revenue Department, we have between the Collectors of districts who are exercising very important and responsible functions and the Government, only one central office, and that is the Board of Revenue. I will take it that the Board of Revenue will for the purposes of comparison correspond to the head of the department in the Police, namely the inspector-general of Police. There is no intermediary like that of the deputy inspector-general of police in that department, though the duties are even more important. I therefore suggest, Sir, that the whole matter ought to be thoroughly investigated, and that it ought to be decided whether it is necessary to retain that intermediary officer for any further length of time. So far as the Police Commission is concerned, it was dealing with an institution in existence, and it was difficult to introduce changes in the existing institutions. If to-day there is opposition to the motion on the part of the Government, it is perfectly natural that it is so on account of the fact that this system has been in operation for several years, and that it is difficult to introduce changes. You may remember that when we have all along been asking for devolution

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

[22nd March 1922]

of powers on district officers, there is no sufficient justification for not trying the experiment in certain districts to start with and for not giving them larger powers than have been proposed to be given."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I ask if the hon. Member will be prepared to dispense with appeals ? "

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I do not propose that appeals should be dispensed with at all, Sir I think these appeals may lie with the Inspector-general of Police. What I would suggest is that so long as it is found that this is a new machinery which is not to be found in other similar departments, it is necessary to consider whether by a further devolution of powers upon district officers this cannot be done away with. I believe that even in the case of the head of the Education Department, the Director of Public Instruction deals directly with his district officers in a number of questions from time to time. I cannot really understand why in this department in particular there should be this additional machinery. We find that the inspector-general has been given an assistant, and a deputy superintendent of police has also been placed under his charge for the purpose of superintendence. If on account of the heavy work which he will have to discharge further assistance is found to be necessary, such assistance might be given to him. But to create another intermediary officer, I submit, will not conduce to the proper working of the system."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I deal with one single point raised by the last speaker, that is, the question of these intermediary officers being unnecessary ? I do not wish to speak on the general question of the work done by the deputy inspectors-general, as sufficient has been said on that side of the matter by my hon. Colleague. I should however like to add to what he has said that it should be quite possible to show by reference to statistics of the appeals heard by deputy inspectors-general that, if all of them were to be concentrated in the head office you would have to add a deputy or deputies then to deal with them. If you are going to abolish the deputy inspectors-general you are going to concentrate all the appeals on the inspector-general."

" The point on which I wish to lay stress is this. It was only the other day that Mr. Sadasiva Bhat moved a resolution in this Council in which he asked us to take steps to prevent transfers from one end of the presidency to the other, and to appoint officers from within certain territorial areas and keep them there as far as possible. It was said on behalf of the Government that we would do what we could to arrange matters as he desired. But how are we to arrange the recruitment and transfer of officers within territorial or linguistic areas if we have no local authorities in control of those areas ? That seems to be one of the essentials to carry out the wish of the Council as expressed by Mr. Sadasiva Bhat. If you take officers like the sub-inspectors of police, of whom there are hundreds all over the presidency, you must have some controlling officer who is responsible for the recruitment and transfers if the matter is not to be allowed to fall into the hands of some subordinate officer to whom it may be a source of profit. Similarly, if you want to deal with the question of languages and if you want to recruit men of different languages and different castes and to see that each gets its share, you cannot do it if the whole thing is run from Madras. The hon. Member said : ' you don't have these intermediate officers in similar departments ' and

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

I was particular to ask him what are the similar departments, because that is just what we do have. That is one reason why we are not cutting out superintending engineers or deputy commissioners of salt and abkari.

“One department in which we do not make these arrangements, and which is consequently the subject of constant criticism in the Council, is the Medical Department. I ask the Council if they wish that the sub-inspectors of police should be placed in the same position as the sub-assistant surgeons. The hon. Member stated, in answer to my request, Sir, that one of the departments which has no intermediary officers is the Revenue Department. Now, as to that what I should like to say is this: that each district is self-contained. We have a number of revenue inspectors and others there, and there is no need for the transfer of these men from one district to another. That is the reason why we do not require an intermediary officer in this particular case, though I should like to add that whether we need it or not is a moot point, and that in every province except Madras, there are intermediary officers in the shape of divisional commissioners who perform the very functions which the deputy inspectors-general of police performs in the Police Department. We have been told that the Education Department is somewhat similar. In the Education Department, however, do not inspectors of schools perform these functions? It may be said that one of these days the inspectors will be district officers. By that time, I hope there will be so many officers in the Education Department that as in the Revenue Department, each district will be able to depend on itself. I appeal to the Council that if they really want this principle of territorial divisions and of restricting transfers to each such division, if they want this plan to be carried out in a reasonable way, then they should not cut out the only officers through whose agency we are able to carry it out.”

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“I may say, Sir, that so far as the hon. the Home Member is concerned, he was reading from an anti-deluge report. Such reports were made from time to time either by Royal Commissions or by other commissions and were intended to place both Indians and Europeans already employed or to be employed in the Police Department and various other departments in a better position. There is absolutely no use of reading from a report like this when we are dealing with retrenchment, i.e., from a report which was primarily intended to increase the pay and the number and emoluments of various appointments.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—“Do I understand the hon. Member seriously to say that the report of the Police Commission was primarily intended for the purpose of increasing pay and the number of appointments? The Commission was for the purpose of putting the Police Department in a more efficient condition.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“May I also demur to the reforms being referred to as the deluge?”

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“I maintain that the object of the report of the Police Commission was mainly to improve the status and increase the number of these officers. It may be that their object was also to increase the efficiency. Sometimes deluges are very good as they wash away useless things. Whatever that may be, I wanted to contrast the present with the anti-deluge period. We are in the process of carrying retrenchment. The complaint is that the tax-payer is now paying 3 pies

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [22nd March 1922]

where he was paying only one pie in the old days. If the Government had the courtesy of accepting the motion for appointing a retrenchment committee like the one to be appointed in the Legislative Assembly, the report of that committee will have great weight with us and I do appeal that at least hereafter a retrenchment committee should be appointed to go into the whole question. As for the edifice being properly and efficiently manned, if we go to a contractor, he will say 'the foundation is all right, but something more may be added to the arch; use a girder to make the building more beautiful and more strong. In this way every appointment from the lowest to the highest has been made by way of strengthening the edifice and any number of intermediary officers are added. So far as the police officers are concerned, what I say is, take away the powers of the intermediary officers, say the deputy inspectors-general, and transfer them, some to officers above them and some to officers below them. The difficulties are not insurmountable as they are imagined to be. As regards appeals, we know how these district superintendents of police and deputy superintendents can do this work satisfactorily. It is only in very serious cases that an appeal may come to the inspector-general.

"However, Sir, our hope does not lie in arguing out these things in a few minutes. The best thing for the Government and for the Council will be to agree to appoint a retrenchment committee to go into the various questions. I hope that if that committee is appointed good deal of the work of the Council will be reduced and motions relating to the various appointments—motions like those notice of which was given by Mr. Abdul Rahman Sahib—need not be discussed in the Council. With these words I beg to withdraw my motion".

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 473.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

473. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 21,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 2,100.*

"The provision in the revised estimate is Rs. 22,000 and the budget provision is Rs. 21,000. There is a reduction of only Rs. 1,000. If my motion is accepted, the reduction will be by 25 per cent."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I take it, Sir, that this item represents the allotment for the travelling allowances of the inspector-general of police, the deputy inspectors-general and their camp clerks. These officers take very small establishments on tour with them. The great bulk of the provision is therefore, I have no doubt, for the travelling allowance of the officers themselves. The inspector-general travels throughout the whole of the Presidency. The ranges of the deputy inspectors-general are very extensive and the journeys which they must undertake cover large distances. The provision made this year is, I see, Rs. 1,000 less than the revised estimate figure, Rs. 6,500 less than the budget figure for 1921-22 and Rs. 126 less than the actual accounts of 1920-21. A considerable portion of the travelling allowance consists in the recoupment of railway fares, and we have recently been informed of an enhancement in the railway rates. Whether that has been taken into account in the allotment of Rs. 21,000

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

put down here, I cannot positively say, and it is possible that it may not have been considered. So much as regards the adequacy of the actual figure. I shall be thankful if the amount as it stands proves to be sufficient.

"I understand that the motive underlying this motion, however, is to base a reduction of 25 per cent on the anticipation that there will be a further revision in the scale of travelling allowance. If there is any such revision, it will automatically reduce the amounts drawn by the officers concerned. But whether the inspector-general of police and the deputy inspectors-general actually received any increase in consequence of the late revision of travelling allowances, I am not quite certain. But however that may be, if the scale should be again revised and reduced, the reduction will operate automatically on any expenditure on account of travelling allowances covered by the revision.

"I come now to what really is the point of substance, as I indicated in connexion with the similar proposal to reduce the travelling allowances of district magistrates and subdivisional magistrates the other day. The House then accepted my view that the circumstances connected with the maintenance of law and order render it necessary to make exception in favour of the officers directly charged with that duty. If it is necessary to make an exception in the case of district magistrates, it is *a fortiori* necessary to make an exception in the case of police officers. For, the travelling of a police officer is dependent upon circumstances entirely beyond his control. If a grave crime suddenly occurs in a distant place, it is his duty to go there and investigate it at once. If a disturbance breaks out in one part of the Presidency, it is the duty of the deputy inspector-general of police in charge of the range to proceed to the spot at once. Let me give a particular instance. On the outbreak of the Mappilla rebellion, the deputy inspector-general, Mr. Mainwaring, was on the spot at Tirur and actually marched with Mr. Thomas to Tirurāngadi leaving his orderlies and servants at Tirur. The whole of his camp fell into the hands of the rebels. That is an illustration of the imperative call upon these officers to undertake journeys at once if necessity arises. I could not possibly ask the inspector-general of police to issue any order which in the guise of curtailing the expenditure on travelling might be interpreted by the officers to whom it is addressed as an instruction not to travel to places to which their duty calls them. I look on it as a very serious matter to reduce allotments for

travelling allowances, especially in the case of police officers, unless it be on the clear understanding that the reduction shall not be converted into any instruction to restrict travelling and that the House will be fully prepared on cause shown to increase the allotments if the necessary additional funds cannot be found by reappropriation. I cannot consent to anything of the nature of instructions to the higher or the lower police officers to restrict their travelling."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"Do I understand the hon. the Home Member to say that the Government are intending to reduce the scale of travelling allowances in other departments except the police?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I said nothing of the sort, Sir. What I stated was that if the Government, in pursuance of the examination which the hon. the Finance Member referred to in his opening statement, decide to reduce or modify the scale of travelling allowances,

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

then any such reduction or modification would presumably apply to the police equally with other departments. As hon. Members are aware, the matter is still under examination."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I may make it clear, Sir, that in bringing forward this motion, it was not my intention that the police officers should do less of travelling now than before. This House wanted to cut down the travelling allowances to the extent of 10 per cent and we made it clear then that there must be a revision in the rates of travelling allowances that were already fixed by the Government. This House clearly expressed its views in a resolution and I only want that that resolution should be given effect to. If only the rates are revised, I think there will be no difficulty at all and the amount thus diminished will be a saving. The travelling can be done as usual. For these reasons I press my motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I only want to explain how matters stand in the matter of travelling allowances. It is not at all an easy matter to carry out the revision which the House has desired. We have a note which is ready to be placed before the Finance Committee and in anticipation of the reduction that we expect to make on that note we have actually carried out reductions by 25 per cent. In this particular item the original provision was Rs. 27,500, which we reduced to Rs. 21,000: so that, if the Council wants to make another 10 per cent reduction, that would amount to 35 per cent."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I take it, Sir, that the budget provided for Rs. 27,500."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Rupees 27,500 is the original budget provision, which was reduced by the Finance Department in consultation with the Finance Committee."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Was it not the understanding that reduction by 25 per cent should be with reference to the revised estimates rather than the original budget estimates?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, this is the first time I hear of that understanding."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I do not press my motion, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 474 and 475.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

474. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,22,400 for police superintendence by Rs. 15,000.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—

475. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,22,400 for police superintendence.*

Motion 476.

Mr. R. SEINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

476. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,22,400 for police superintendents by Rs. 100.*

22nd March 1922]

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

"Sir, in making this motion I have absolutely no desire to embarrass or paralyse the Government to any extent. My only desire and my sole object was to elicit some detailed information from the hon. the Home Member as to why notwithstanding the fact that sixty years have passed since the police force was organized in this Presidency under Act XXIV of 1859, up till now no Indian was thought of in connexion with the appointments of the assistant inspector-general of police and the deputy inspector-general of police. It seems to me that time has come for the Government to reconsider their position and to try sincerely and earnestly the experiment of appointing Indians in the higher spheres of public life. These 60 years the world has seen and noticed kaleidoscopic changes with reference to the various other departments of public life. Experiments have been made in the revenue, judicial and engineering departments and they have also proved successful. Men have been tried and found not wanting, and there is absolutely no reason why the Government should not profit themselves by the experiments so far made and successfully carried out and why similar experiments should not be made in this department also. I hope and trust that sooner or later—better sooner than later—the hon. the Home Member will see his way to consider the claims of Indians favourably and also see his way to appoint at least one Indian as deputy inspector-general of police."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I very much wish that the hon. the Mover had given me previous intimation of his intention to take this point, for then I should have come fully prepared to give the necessary answer. As it is, I am compelled to trust to my memory in regard to facts and figures. I will first call the attention of hon. Members once again to the report of the Indian Police Commission. One of the terms of reference to that body in pursuance of the resolution which constituted it in 1902 desired them to inquire and report

'whether the career at present offered to natives in the police'—

in those days the term 'native' was used without any objection being taken; nobody seems then to have resented being described as a native of the country of his birth and residence as people do in these days, any more than I should resent being called a native of England or Scotland—

'is sufficiently attractive to induce the proper stamp of men to enter it; and if not, what steps can be taken to remedy this evil consistently with the recognized measure of necessity for European control in the district charges.'

"That, Sir, brings out the fact that in 1902 it was an accepted axiom that there should be European control of the district police charges. Since 1902 much water has flowed under the bridge and for a long time past provision has been made to the appointment of a limited number of Indian superintendents of police in district charges. There is specific provision for that in the Police Orders of this Presidency. There are two such appointments as will be found by reference to Police Order No. 43 which lays down that the number of deputy superintendents 'to be thus permanently promoted should not, for the present, exceed two.' That was the next stage. The third stage was in connexion with the report of the Public Services Commission which was required *inter alia* to investigate whether it was necessary to increase the number of posts of superintendents of police open to the Provincial Service, and the outcome of those enquiries

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

was two-fold. Arrangements were made for the transfer to the Imperial Police of selected officers of the Provincial Service and in addition to this there were what I may call 'listed' appointments of superintendents: that is to say, if a man enters the Provincial Service he has two spheres of advancement. The latter, normally applicable to the experienced Provincial officer nearing the end of his service, is the post of district superintendent of police in the same service but on a special scale of pay. That is one sphere of advancement. The other sphere is open to the younger, more energetic and particularly promising deputy superintendent who is told that if specially selected he may expect a transfer to the Imperial Service. That is naturally an exceptional course and I am not quite certain whether it will be a permanent arrangement, but I do know that several young officers, men of 8, 9 and 10 years of service, have recently been brought on to the Imperial branch. I am not certain whether it is a permanent arrangement because simultaneously with this arrangement there has come into force the method of direct recruitment of Indians to the Imperial Service. Only the other day I was sitting on a selection committee which was examining a number of young Indians who sought to be appointed directly to the grade of assistant superintendents of police in the Imperial branch. We made a selection of twelve very promising young fellows and a competitive examination was held, as a result of which two of them have been selected and brought into the Imperial Service. I think they both passed their medical examination; that was the only bar which stood in their way, and as both of them called on me a few days ago, I imagine that they did pass the medical board. They were very promising young fellows and I hope they will prove an addition of strength to the department and will rise in it having due regard to the seniority of those who stand above them. That, Sir, is the direction in which the appointment of an Indian to the grade of deputy inspector-general is likely to become a practicable proposition. There is I think no chance whatever of introducing 'listed' deputy inspectors-general reserved for the Provincial Service any more than in my judgment there is a prospect of creating 'listed' conservators of forests. It is a question of technical training and administrative experience."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"Is this the 'increasing association of Indians' that was declared in the preamble to the Government of India Act?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I have just been explaining, Sir, how the increasing association of Indians with the department is being brought about. I fear the hon. Member is rather impatient. It is in the direction I have mentioned that deputy inspectors-general are likely to be found in the Indian personnel of the department, and it will probably not arise in the immediate future. There is now among the Imperial Police of the Madras Presidency a definite Indian element—I do not know the exact number—which is increasing and as time goes by, these officers will rise to such a stage of seniority that they will be entitled as a matter of course to be considered for the purposes of vacancies in the post of deputy inspector-general. I cannot say off-hand whether that prospect has been definitely recognized by the Government of India and the Secretary of State because I have not had notice of this point and I have not been able to refresh my memory by reference to the papers, but whether it is definitely

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

recognized in the resolution bearing on the subject of reconstitution of the Police department or whether it is not, that avenue is certainly likely to be opened in the future."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"The hon. the Home Member drew our attention to the Police Commission report which, if not antediluvian, is rather quite antiquated. It is a report of 1905, if I remember aright, of the materials that were collected in 1903 or thereabouts. Since then seventeen years have rolled by and the world as everybody is fully aware has been rushing along at a giddy pace and the outlook has undergone a material change and I expected quite a sympathetic answer. I only expected the hon. the Home Member to give us an assurance that he will see his way to try the experiment of having an Indian as deputy inspector-general of police. But he is inclined to think that having regard to the limitations of service, having regard to the years of service which certain incumbents or office-holders have put in, there is absolutely very little prospect of an Indian being appointed as deputy inspector-general of police in the very near future. I am really sorry for this; but however there is absolutely no reason as to why the experiments which have been made in that direction in other departments should not also be made as a tentative measure in this department as well. Far from being tempted to withdraw it, I deem it my duty to press this motion."

The motion was put and lost.

Motion 477

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—

477. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,22,400 for police superintendents by Rs. 100.*

Motion 478.

12-45 p.m

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

478. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,88,160 for deputy superintendents by Rs. 75,000.*

"In tabling this motion my idea was that the intermediary posts like the posts of inspectors and deputy superintendents of police should be reduced to a great extent so that greater powers might be given to sub-inspectors.—"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Does the hon. Member think that deputy superintendents and inspectors are intermediary officers between the sub-inspector and the superintendent? That is the implication of his remark."

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—"I was exactly going to that point, Sir. It will be found in the list of motions on the budget that I have also given notice of a motion to reduce the allotment of inspectors also. I am not dealing with that point now. My view is to see a reduction made in the allotments for intermediary posts between the sub-inspectors and the district superintendents. Hon. Members are aware that we are spending in the Madras Presidency about two annas in the rupee for the police administration. In the other provinces, notably in Bengal, where

[Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya] [22nd March 1922]

disturbances are more frequent and police aid is more necessary, they spend a much lower percentage. So far as the statistics go, we seem to be spending a disproportionately large amount for the police administration. It is rather very undesirable. Therefore I say that these intermediary officers of police inspectors and deputy superintendents might be very largely reduced in course of time. I do not mean that they can be sent away all at once; the duties may be so allocated that these men may be gradually reduced. In making another motion, my hon. friend, Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar, has given us several reasons why deputy inspectors-general are not after all so very necessary and that, though not all of them, some at least of them may be abolished. The allocation of duties may be made on the lines suggested by Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. Those suggestions hold good in the case of deputy superintendents also. Therefore I move that the allotment of Rs. 1,88,160 for deputy superintendents be reduced by Rs. 75,000."

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI:—"Mr. President, I rise to support the motion. I have also given notice of a similar motion. The sub-inspector of police with the aid of his constables is held responsible for the maintenance of peace and order in his jurisdiction. He visits every village attached to his station, detects cases, investigates them, files charge sheet and conducts prosecutions. His work is closely scrutinized and supervised by the circle inspector of police. Now the question presents itself why so many deputy superintendents should be given place in the department. Is it merely to supervise the work of those supervisors who in their turn supervise the work of a sub-inspector or to act as a signing machine? The deputy superintendent's post in the mufassal is something of the nature of a white elephant. He knows very little of the conditions that exist in the place. It passes my comprehension, Sir, why as many as 32 deputy superintendents of police consuming Rs. 1,88,160 every year should be appointed. The number may well be reduced by two-fifths, for they do nothing except form the connecting link between the district superintendent and the circle inspector without which the administration of the department may be carried on as usual."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I do not think that either the mover or the seconder can realize what the effect of accepting this motion would be. The deputy superintendents of police constitute the Provincial Police Service, and if they are annihilated the number of Indians in the superior ranks in the department will be very substantially reduced. The functions of deputy superintendents of police correspond ordinarily to the functions of the assistant superintendents of police. They hold subdivisional charges in the districts, and there is not the least doubt that there is ample employment in such charges for the present staff. The question of additions to it has, I think, on two occasions been before the Finance Committee this year or last year. The number of deputy superintendents is carefully worked out with reference to the actual charges which have to be held. They are not all subdivisional charges and the deputy superintendents form the Provincial branch of the Madras Police department. I see from the Civil List that their total number is 41; it is from this cadre that the 'listed' posts of superintendent of police are filled up, and that promising young officers are transferred to the Imperial Service. If there is any serious question as to the necessity for the number of the cadre, I can

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

without difficulty satisfy the hon. Mover and his seconder that it is in no way excessive. But with the length of time now at my disposal it is not possible to detail the necessity for the sanctioned strength. You may take my word for it that each of these officers fills a definite post which must be held by some one and if a number of them be abolished, I find it difficult to see how the work of these particular posts can be carried on."

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI:—"I should like to support this motion. The hon. the Home Member has not made it clear what kind of work these deputy superintendents are required to do in the scheme of police administration in this country. There are the sub-inspectors who investigate crime and who bring everything necessary to put up the case before the magistrate. There is the inspector of police to supervise their work and also the stations and to give them advice where necessary. For a long time we were able to do without the institution of the deputy superintendents of police. These deputy superintendents of police go to the places where they have not much to do and where these sub-inspectors have to look after their creature comforts. That is an open secret. The sub-inspector who has this trouble in his turn goes to those under him and presses them until the pressure spreads over the villagers in various ways. This thing goes on. There is also another grievance. If there is a deputy superintendent in a district, the district superintendent of police does not feel any responsibility in the administration. There were a number of complaints recently by certain villagers against a particular sub-inspector, who was said to be levying blackmail on the villagers, and to be tyrannizing over them. I had to bring it to the notice of the district magistrate and particularly requested him that the inquiry should not be by a police officer. Anyhow a deputy superintendent was sent, who went there and examined certain witnesses. Then he said there was no case without giving any reason for such an inference. There was only the endorsement that the complaint had no foundation. I had to approach the district superintendent of police, who said that the deputy superintendent had already examined the matter and therefore he would not go into the details and that was not his job. The great evil of the deputy superintendent is therefore the fact that he reduces the responsibility on the part of the district superintendent of police who seems to think that he need not bother himself about the subdivision under the charge of a deputy superintendent. This is a condition which is not desirable. The Home Member urged that this institution of the deputy superintendents supplied a stepping stone for Indians to ascend to the Imperial Service. What does the tax-payer care whether the police man belongs to Provincial or Imperial Service when the deficit budget stares him in his face? What does he care whether there is an Indian deputy inspector-general of police or a European deputy inspector-general of police? It is not for the sake of promising young men as the hon. the Home Member said that we are here, but we are here to see that the general tax-payer is benefited. When we can do without the deputy superintendents, when there are the evils I have pointed out in their retention, I do not see the fun of retaining these officers and add to our deficits. I would like to see the whole cadre abolished, but we must make small beginnings."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I want to say a few words. I am very sorry at the turn the discussion has taken.

1 p.m.

Certainly, it is not correct to say that the tax-payer does not

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [22nd March 1922]

care whether an Indian or Englishman is appointed to these posts. From the financial point of view, it does matter very much. An Indian means lesser pay, lesser allowances and all those things. Even if this resolution is carried, as has been pointed out by the hon. the Home Member, the divisions will be there. The proper resolution should be to reduce the number of divisions. The only way of effecting retrenchment, if the Government would agree with this view, would be to post a number of these deputy superintendents as assistant superintendents and reduce the number of divisions, so that the assistant superintendents' divisions may be lesser in number. But the proposition as it is, if carried, will only lead to the divisions being there, the assistant superintendents being increased and the number of deputy superintendents being lessened, with the result that more costly people will be placed in the deputy superintendents' divisions. I do say that in this edifice of the Police department there are too many corner stones, and somewhere we must find a reduction, but that place I would submit is not the deputy superintendent's.

"I know, Sir, that the number of divisions, so far as the deputy and assistant superintendents' charges are concerned, have been considerably increased in recent times and the sooner the number is reduced the better. There is also one other thing. I am very sorry that Mr. Sivasankaram Pillai should have stated that the deputy superintendents are preying upon the people like sub-inspectors. He has placed the latter in the same category with the former. I know many of these deputy superintendents. Whatever the defects so far as the principle and system are concerned may be, I think many of them are honest—most of them I may say—and are doing their best. If there is anything wrong, it is the system that has to be blamed. Of course, he referred to a particular case where birds of the same feather flocked together. He said that if the police officer is told that his subordinate has done some wrong, he always presumed that the public is wrong and not the police. The same is the case with the Forest or Excise or other officers. It is very difficult to convince any higher officer that his subordinate has done wrong. On that ground alone you cannot say that the whole class should go. The number of deputy superintendents compared with that of the divisions is very small. One great reduction that could be made, I believe, is in the cadre of the personal assistants to district superintendents. I think the hon. the Home Member would show as to where the necessity for personal assistants arose. Sir, some years ago, there were no deputy superintendents as personal assistants and the whole work was done by the office manager, who was then called the headquarters inspector. It was not considered in those days necessary to have personal assistants in every district office. The Collector wanted to have a personal assistant, and so the district superintendent also seemed to require a personal assistant. Let us hope now that personal assistants to Collectors are going, these personal assistants to the district superintendents also will go away. The hon. the Revenue Member has made a very good retrenchment in that department where the personal assistants are going away. Now that the Collectors are dispensing or are compelled to dispense with the personal assistants, there is no reason why the district superintendents should not be asked to dispense with their personal assistants also. By saying that the number of personal assistants should be reduced, I do not mean that the number of deputy superintendents should be reduced. What I say is that

22nd March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

the deputy superintendents that would be relieved from the offices may be posted to divisions and thereby a reduction in the expenditure over divisions may be made."

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—"From the remarks of the hon. the Home Member, I understand he seems to have bestowed some attention in regard to the reduction of the personal assistants to district superintendents. I suppose that this will come up in the next motion. So I have no objection to withdraw this motion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"If the specific question of personal assistants to district superintendents does not come up on a later motion, I am ready to make a few remarks about the issue now."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I understand the hon. Member Mr. Gopalakrishnayya to say that he understood that the Home Member was considering the question of the personal assistants to the district superintendents with a view to their abolition, and on that understanding he proposes to withdraw the motion. To the best of my recollection the hon. the Home Member has said nothing to that effect."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I did not say anything with regard to that. But I should like to say a few words in answer to Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar's suggestion that the personal assistants to district superintendents are not necessary. At present the duties of the deputy superintendents who are employed as personal assistants are not confined to the functions of mere office managers. Under Police Order No. 109, they 'may be assigned any duties, either office or executive, which the superintendent may find it most advantageous to have performed by them.' Sometimes they are sent out to investigate particularly involved cases, to which another senior officer cannot find time to attend; sometimes to investigate political activities of a dangerous description in a remote part of the district. They are employed in fact on any duty that the district superintendent thinks fit to assign to them, and they are of very considerable assistance to district superintendents. Mr. Thomas, whose experience of the department entitles his opinion to the greatest weight, sometime since put forward an alternative scheme for the transfer of these personal assistants to subdivisional charges. But this alternative, so far from involving a reduction in the number of subdivisions, carried with it an increase in their number. I will explain how. If in a district the superintendent himself holds what is called the main range, this means that there are tracts under his direct charge, the detailed administration of which seriously hampers the efficiency of his general supervision of the district. It was proposed that in such cases the personal assistants should be placed in direct charge of the main range which would thus become a new subdivision, thus giving relief to the superintendent. Such a change recalls to me similar changes in the Revenue department. When I first came out to this country, a revenue district was divided between the charge of the collector and the charge of the sub-collector. The head assistants and special assistants merely held portions of the collector's charge. This main division was administered by the collector with the assistance of what are now called divisional officers. The rest of the district, known as the 'subdivision' was administered by the sub-collector, and the sub-collector in those days had greater powers than the

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

sub-collector of to-day. In course of time, it was found that the arrangement was not very satisfactory. There was friction at times between the sub-collector and the collector. The outcome of it all was that the whole district was divided into a number of divisional charges such as exist to-day held each by a divisional officer who, if a member of the Indian Civil Service, is usually called a sub-collector. That is a state of affairs which I should like to introduce also into the Police department, for I am convinced that the direct charge of all the divisions of the district ought to be in the hands of special officers, and not as at present sometimes in the hands of the officer who supervises the entire district. There is much routine which an officer of the rank of superintendent ought not to be troubled with. Now that is the direction in which I hope to see the personal assistants vanish, but their allotment to new subdivisions will not lead to any reduction in their number. During the past year alone I have received proposals for substantial addition to the number of subdivisions, which have passed the scrutiny of the Finance Committee."

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—" I do not want to press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 479.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI :—

479. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,88,160 for deputy superintendents.*

Motion 480.

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

480. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 18,000 for temporary deputy superintendents.*

" I wish to know whether these appointments which are only temporary cannot be abolished."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" These five temporary appointments are the appointments which I had in view just now when I said that the necessity for the creation of additional appointments had been made out to the satisfaction of the Finance Committee. I can give particulars, if desired. But I may say that the case put forward on behalf of the department was for permanent additions, and that as a matter of economy the additions sanctioned were only temporary."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 481 to 487.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

481. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 18,000 for five temporary deputy superintendents.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

482. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 18,000 for temporary deputy superintendents.*

22nd March 1922]

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

483. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,67,000 for salaries by Rs. 100.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

484. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,67,000 for salaries by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

485. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,82,000 for inspectors by Rs. 2,00,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

486. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,82,000 for inspectors by Rs. 1,50,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

487. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,472 for the Nilgiris reserve."*

Motion 488.

1-15 p.m.

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—" Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

488. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,344 for the punitive police, Kamudi.*

" My intention at the time of tabling this motion was to get information from the hon. the Home Member whether he has given effect to the resolution which the House passed by an overwhelming majority in the Council meeting of 21st January 1922 regarding the repealing of the Government Order for the levying of punitive tax upon two of the most loyal communities in and around Kamudi. But now, I was instructed as the representative in this House of our Mahajana Sangam, which commands a vast influence with our community that the special magistrate in charge is calling on the people to pay the tax for the current year and threatens to issue distress warrants if they do not pay within a week or so. Really, Sir, this threat will be a great blow to the people when they are under the impression that this assembly of the representatives of the whole Presidency passed a resolution not to levy the punitive tax on them. If this is to be the fate of the resolutions affecting the interests of the people, I doubt very much, Sir, what benefit we are getting by resolutions of this House. This evidently shows that the Government have decided to collect the tax for the coming year. So far as I have been able to examine the budget, I cannot see in what account credit is taken for the amount that is collected as punitive tax. I shall be obliged if the hon. the Home Member will kindly enlighten me on this point."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Will the hon. Member please repeat his point? He wants certain information but I have been quite unable to catch the exact point."

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—" If an additional police is necessary for that area, let the Government have it by all means. But, Sir, what I object to is the levying of punitive tax from two loyal communities by having a force of punitive police thrust on them. So, Sir, in fairness——"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I have still not caught the point, Sir."

[22nd March 1922]

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—"So, Sir, in fairness to the distressed condition of the people, I appeal to the hon. the Home Member to give up the punitive police altogether, which, considering the grievances that people have to undergo, is not at all necessary."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member's point is that the punitive police at Kamudi is not necessary and that the sum of Rs. 20,344 provided therefor may therefore be deleted."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"That is not asking for information. If the hon. Member really wishes to know whether the police at Kamudi are necessary, I can only repeat what I said in connexion with the resolution relating to this subject on the 21st January. I am advised that they are necessary and I do not think that in the course of the debate above referred to the necessity for the additional police was seriously disputed at all. If that is all the hon. Mover wants to know——"

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—"I want to know whether the Government are going to collect the punitive tax from the people."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"The answer to that enquiry is this: whether the cost of this punitive police should continue to be levied from the inhabitants of the area was a question specifically considered in full Cabinet the other day with the result that it was decided that the tax should continue to be so levied until October next."

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—"Do I understand the hon. the Home Member that they are not going to levy the tax from the people?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The Government, I take it, are not going to stop the levy of the tax."

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—"Then I insist upon a division."

The motion was put to the vote and declared carried.

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson demanded a poll.

The polling was done and the Secretary began the counting.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I must draw the attention of hon. Members to the fact that three hon. Members came in and took their seats after the polling had begun and when it was going on. Of course their votes have not been recorded; an irregularity like that should not recur."

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—"I did not vote, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"It is not a question of voting. When once polling has begun, no hon. Member should come in till it is finished; otherwise confusion will result."

The following is the result of the poll :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 8. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. |
| 2. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 9. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 10. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 11. Mr. K. A. Kandesawi Kandar. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 12. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 13. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. |
| 7. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 14. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. |

22nd March 1922]

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 15. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 32. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 16. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 33. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahesayo. |
| 17. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 34. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. |
| 18. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 35. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 19. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 36. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 20. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | 37. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 21. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 38. Sriman Sesi Bhushana Rath Mahesayo. |
| 22. Mr. P. Subbarayan. | 39. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |
| 23. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 40. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 24. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayakar. | 41. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 25. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | 42. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar. |
| 26. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. | 43. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 27. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. | 44. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 28. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | 45. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 29. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | 46. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib. |
| 30. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 47. Mr. Muhammad Abdur Rabim Khan Sahib. |
| 31. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 48. Mr. Abdul Razzaq Sahib. |
| | 49. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 11. Mr. R. Littlebailes. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ullah Sahib Bahadur. | 12. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 15. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad Bahadur. |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 16. Mr. T. Shanmukham Pillai. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 17. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 18. Mr. A. E. Rencontre. |
| | 19. Mr. T. Richmond. |

The motion was carried, 49 voting for and 19 against.

Motion 489.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I beg to make the following motion:—

489. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 84,800 for special police by Rs. 100.*

"My reason for asking for a reduction is to draw the attention of the House to the imposition of a punitive police in Cuddapah district. I do not find any provision included in the budget itself, but in paragraph 89, page 48 of the Statement prepared by the Finance Department, I find the following is mentioned:—

"The budget estimate for 1922-23 includes provision for recoveries on account of the special punitive police sanctioned for the Gōdavari, Anantapur, Cuddapah and Guntūr districts."

"Presumably the portion in Cuddapah refers to Rayachoti taluk. I want to know the reasons why punitive police has been imposed on that place. Is it because the people of that taluk are violent in character, or is it because of the movement to which exception is being taken now? So far as I know, Rayachoti taluk is not at all to be compared with taluks like Jammalamadugu in Cuddapah or Koilkuntla in Kurnool district. If it is said that there is non-co-operation movement there, I am afraid that is not a correct statement. Some village officers did resign, but I understand that many of them have withdrawn their resignations and re-joined their appointments.

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [22nd March 1922]

I think it is not fair that the innocent people of this taluk should be saddled with taxes for punitive police. I wish only to remind the hon. the Home Member of what he said yesterday, i.e., that some people with no responsibility whatever go about from place to place preaching mischievous doctrines, and because temporarily some people get excited, I do not think it fair that the people as a whole should be punished with taxes like this."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I may inform the House that the additional police in Rayachoti taluk of the Cuddapah district are not included in this item and the failure to remove that item is a mistake committed in the course of the preparation of the budget. But it is proposed to rectify that mistake by putting in a supplementary demand. However, I am quite prepared to briefly discuss the merits of the need for additional police in Cuddapah district now."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"If the 'additional police' in the Cuddapah district is not included in this particular grant, there is no use of discussing the merits of that additional police now ; it would be out of order to do so."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Then there is now no need at all for my motion. I therefore withdraw it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 490 to 492.

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

490. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,200 for police training schools by Rs. 50,000."*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

491. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,200 for police training schools by Rs. 12,200.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

492. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,00,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Motion 493.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

493. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,21,06,300 under district executive force by Rs. 50,000.*

"Mr. President, at the outset, I will frankly admit that my object in moving for a reduction of this nature is not to cast any slur on the district executive police force. Nor is it my intention to express any disapproval of the way in which they have been carrying on their work. I am quite prepared to endorse the remarks of the hon. the Home Member that the rank and file and even officers have discharged their duties most satisfactorily, have shown remarkable restraint and forbearance even under provocation, under trying conditions. If I propose for a reduction, it is with the object, first of all, of improving the efficiency of the police force as a whole, and secondly to release funds for improving the pay of the constables to keep them above want and above temptation.

22nd March 1922] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

“To take the first point, Sir, i.e., to improve the efficiency of the police force, I think it is very desirable that the higher grade officers come immediately or oftener than now in contact with all classes and conditions of people. I find a sentence in the report on the Administration of Police for the year 1920 which reads as follows :—

‘In the previous year these changes were due to the grant of leave to a large number of officers and the uncertainty of the dates of return of those on leave.’

“Now this raises a suspicion and a doubt that because there are very many deputy superintendents to do a great deal of work which 1-30 p.m. would otherwise have to be done by higher officers, it is possible for a large number of the latter to go on leave.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“May I request the speaker, Sir, to refer me to the paragraph which he was quoting from?”

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“I was quoting from the first page, Sir. In times of stress, we know that, in every country, there is a practice of officers cancelling their leave and returning to their duty. I do not say that we are in times of war, nor are we quite in times of absolute peace or at least of freedom from disquieting conditions. So I think that in addition to the many reasons which were urged by hon. Members for the reduction of the number of posts of deputy superintendents of police, we might add this, namely, that it is very desirable that the higher officers should themselves move about, check the work of their subordinates, make surprise visits, check the patrols on duty, come in contact with all conditions and classes of people which would be very useful and thus really contribute to the efficiency of the executive police force in the districts.

“Then, Sir, coming to the inspectors, I find a very startling sentence in the report—

‘The prevailing opinion is that there has been a marked deterioration in the type of sub-inspectors that we now get, and the Principal of the Police Training School at Vellore has more than once reported that the cadets who have been under training in recent years are much inferior to their predecessors in mental equipment and those qualities which go to make an efficient police officer.’

“And then, Sir, comes another sentence on page 6—

‘The direct recruitment of inspectors which had been stopped for some years was revived and the Government granted permission to make enlistments up to the full number admissible, the educational standard of the sub-inspectors being much below the mark.’

“The hon. the Home Member will admit that these statements place the question of inspectors and sub-inspectors on the horns of a dilemma. The inspectors are recruited and all the sanctioned appointments are to be filled up because of the inefficiency of the sub-inspectors. So that if there are inspectors, and if that number of inspectors is full, it is because the sub-inspectors now enlisted are not very efficient. If, on the other hand, conversely, the sub-inspectors are very efficient, then certainly there will be no reason why so many inspectors should be appointed. So, whatever the hon. the Home Member may say to this piece of logic now, he must frankly admit that there is a case made out for a reduction. As if this was not sufficiently serious, there comes a further startling revelation, that is—

‘The Principal reports that the material received in the school is not of a very high standard and that the majority of the sub-inspectors find it difficult to pass in all the subjects, but that they were passed out well equipped with muscle and grit.’

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar] [22nd March 1922]

"In this year of grace 1922, Sir, in this enlightened twentieth century, we are told that muscle and grit take the place of intellectual qualities and mental equipment. This is, I think, a piece of grim humour. I thought that the proper place for the development of muscle and grit was not the training college, which is intended chiefly for the training of intellectual powers such as capacity for detection, but the recreation saloon of a Professor Sandow or Professor Ramamurthi or of the physical adviser of whom my friend the hon. the Minister for Education seems to be very fond. Here is a question of our having a number of sub-inspectors who are not very efficient, at least the newly enlisted among them. And because they are inefficient we have a number of inspectors appointed. And then, is there work enough, Sir, for all these sub-inspectors? We are told in that report that there has been a marked decrease in crime. The report says—

'True cases of cognizable crime under the Indian Penal Code excluding nuisances, numbered 59,109 or 8,764 less than in the previous year . . . the volume of grave crime decreased by 7,872 cases, the decrease being general and occurring under every head.'

"And the reason for this decrease of crime is given as follows:—

'Close supervision over local criminals and efficient preventive work brought about a remarkable fall in burglaries, thefts and cattle-thefts.'

"Hon. Members here will admit that those who watch criminals and do a great deal of work in detail are certainly station-house officers and head constables, men who are sprung from the people, and who know the people, and can therefore carry on the work most efficiently, the duty of the sub-inspectors being merely to prepare reports and put in the facts gathered by these men.

"And again, Sir, there is one department of crime where we expect the work of these officers to be most felt and satisfactory, and is there a justification for this increase at least on that strength, namely, that they are doing that work in a very thorough manner? We find, Sir, that—

'Although crime fell to the level of 1918, the percentage of detection was higher than that year, but lower than in 1919. The retrogression was mainly due to the marked failure in murder cases—a class of crime which is neither preventible nor easy of detection. In Nellore, out of 32 cases not a single one ended in conviction, while in Guntur the number detected was only 3 out of 27, in Bellary 5 out of 44 and in Anantapur 6 out of 50.'

"Now, Sir, here we have a class of crime which certainly threatens the peace and security of persons. We have the old proverb which says that murder will out. It is really a strange thing that now we have this mysterious process of murders somehow hushed up and we have our officers coming out with this strange announcement, devising this kind of strange explanation, that murder is neither preventible nor easy of detection. With these words which clearly point to a justification in the reduction of the number of inspectors and sub-inspectors I make this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I am not concerned with the hon. Member's review of the police reports nor with his lessons in logic. If I were, I should find that there is a great deal of variation between his conclusions and his premises. As far as I understand him, he says that better detective work is needed and that the sub-inspectors are of inferior quality from which it would seem that he suggests that we should spend more on our sub-inspectors and that it is desirable that the superior officers should travel more and exercise greater check over their subordinates.

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

Therefore, the logical conclusion would seem to be a large increase in expenditure on the department. But his conclusion is that there should be a saving of Rs. 50,000 and the whole purpose of his motion seems to be, as he told us in the beginning, to spend the amount thus released on the favoured department of Education."

MR. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—" I only wanted to release the funds for increasing the pay of constables, Sir."

THE HON. SIR CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Well, Sir, that is the point on which I wished to speak, namely, what is to be done with the funds that are released by such motions as this. I want this Council to understand that the financial situation of the Government is desperate and is getting more desperate every day. It is not an ordinary normal year in which we have balances on hand to draw upon. Our position is that we have to go to our bankers, the Government of India, for their permission for an overdraft, and whether we shall secure that permission or not is, I venture to think, very doubtful. A telegram has just come in, which gives the result of the Legislative Assembly's voting on the Budget as having increased the deficit of the Government of India to eleven crores and 83 lakhs. Now, if we want any more funds in the course of this year, we have to get the money from them, and I put it to the Council that we are not likely to get any more money or further advances in the course of the year. I would therefore ask the House to make up their mind what is the least amount we are to spend and how we are going to secure sanction from the Government of India to spend up to that amount, and to overdraw our account up to that amount. It must not be forgotten in this connexion that a provision has to be made for village officers which is going to increase our deficit to a very considerable sum."

THE HON. THE PRESIDENT :—" Order, order. I confess I do not quite see that the hon. Member is talking on the proposal to reduce the allotment for the district executive police force. That is the subject now under discussion."

THE HON. SIR CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I answer in one word, Sir? If the hon. Gentleman is able to save Rs. 50,000, that should go not to increase the pay of school teachers or constables, or anybody else, but to reduce the deficit." (Hear, hear.)

THE HON. SIR LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I should like to have an opportunity of traversing some at least of the learned criticisms of the details of the police administration in the past year. I will begin with the closing part of Mr. Arpudās wami Udaiyar's criticism. I am asked why there has been a low percentage of detection and conviction in cases of murder particularly, I think, in the districts of Bellary and Anantapur. And he read several lines of paragraph 25 of the Administration Report of the Inspector-General of Police. But, Sir, he did not continue his quotation so as to include the reasons specifically mentioned for the low percentage of detection in one at least of the districts referred to. If the next sentence had been read, it would have been as follows:—" In the last-named district it is reported that the fear of reprisals deterred witnesses from coming forward to give evidence,"—a characteristic of the Ceded and some other districts in which factions and organised crime are rife. That is the

[Sir. Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

reason why murders do not largely result in convictions in some parts at least of the Presidency. It reveals, Sir, a condition of affairs which in certain areas causes the Government and district officers very grave anxiety. It is that class of factional disorder which makes it necessary from time to time to quarter additional police in particular areas, and it is only right and proper that the inhabitants should pay for the cost. There has been at least one very bad case recently in the Anantapur district and another in the Cuddapah district. A third case is that in regard to which the Council has just light-heartedly eliminated the provision for the maintenance of special police; I refer to Kamudi. When we debated that issue at length the other day, no one really seriously contended that the additional police were not necessary there, but to-day the Council has passed a resolution which, if given effect to, will have the result of removing a much needed force of special police from the scene of a dangerously disturbed area, an area which I may say in passing is not unlikely to become the subject of more serious danger in the near future. I am told that what is known as the Nadar movement is reviving in the districts of Ramnad, Tinnevely and Madura. Evil disposed persons are going about advising the Nadars to insist

1-45 p.m. on their admission into temples where such admission has not been customary; and there are various other forces at work linked up with the inevitable non-co-operation movement which have given us grave reason for anxiety in all these three districts. It is not exactly easy to trace a definite connexion; but I shall not be at all surprised if during the near future disturbances recur. Serious disturbances at Melur are mentioned in the paper this morning probably for similar causes, and, if they continue, it may be necessary to apply for additional police. As it is, an energetic District Magistrate has been able by means of his reserve to keep order. I make these few remarks with reference to the motion 488 which has just been passed by this House, but they are germane also to this motion, which involves a further reduction of Rs. 50,000. The House ought to think, not once but twice and more also, before it lightly proposes to remove a body of police from an area the disturbed conditions of which necessitated its entertainment. This is what has been proposed in the case of the Kamudi special police.

“Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar again cited with horror and surprise the remarks of the Principal of the Training College at Vellore in regard to the inferior material coming forward for admission to the sub-inspector class. I am not surprised, nor am I horrified; but I very much regret that the material that comes forward to-day should be so inferior. But let me tell the House what the real cause is. It is the result of one of two things; either the sub-inspector is not paid sufficiently and additional remuneration is necessary, or the incessant vilifications to which the Police department is subjected throughout the country deters young men of good family from joining the department. I am afraid, Sir, that the second reason is the stronger one and I very much regret its existence. I do wish that this House and the educated public of Southern India in general would do their utmost to abstain from and check this habit of imputing motives to the officers of the Police department and making life generally unpleasant to them. I do not for a moment say that every police officer is free from blame. But there are many many police officers who do not expose themselves to such criticisms. I do not think

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

there is any other department in the Province which is subjected to so much unfair and unreasonable criticism notwithstanding the constant endeavours of the officers and men to perform their duties to the utmost of their ability and in a spirit of zeal and devotion which is beyond all praise.

"I need not say anything further on the need for frequent travelling on the part of the higher officers and the desirability of their exercising a systematic check on their subordinate officers. I am in entire agreement with those views and I commend them to the hon. Gentlemen who at an earlier stage of these discussions were advising us to abolish the post of deputy inspector-general of police. I gather, however, that it is the intention of Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar merely to draw attention to various aspects of the administration and not seriously to move a reduction in the total amount provided for the upkeep of the department. If this is not the case, however, I must assure him that so far as the question of substantial reduction is concerned, I am absolutely at a loss to know where to apply the shears in order to cut away half a lakh of rupees."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"Sir, I am sorry that the hon. the Finance Member has not quite understood my point. I say that it is possible to show a decrease of Rs. 25,000 by removing half a dozen superintendents. It is said that by this removal the amount under travelling allowance would increase. I think, Sir, this increase in the travelling allowance would not be more than what we would realise by the abolition of half a dozen posts. Two or three sub-inspectors from each district might well be taken away: we do not want so many posts. The decrease in crime and the detection of crime justifies reduction. That was my argument, Sir; but I do not propose to press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 494 to 501.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—

494. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,21,06,300 for district executive force by Rs. 100.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

495. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,29,47,300 for district executive force by Rs. 75,000.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

496. *To reduce Rs. 1,12,000, the cost of 1,139 talaiyaris by the cost of Rs. 300.*

497. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,03,283 for Criminal Investigation department by one lakh.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

498. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,03,283 for Criminal Investigation department by Rs. 100.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

499. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,15,000 for special police for Malabar by 2 lakhs.*

[22nd March 1922]

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—

500. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4.15 lakhs for special police for Malabar by 1.*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

501. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,72,91,079 for police by Rs. 100.*

Motion 502.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARIU :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

502. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,72,91,079 for police by 3 lakhs.*

“ In view of what we just now heard from the hon. the Finance Member about a telegram that the Government have received from the Government of India, I think, Sir, that this motion ought to be carried to cover the deficit. I therefore beg to move this.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I am afraid I cannot follow the ground which underlies the hon. Mover's proposal to press the resolution. It seems to me that exactly the same grounds are enough for me to oppose the motion.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ I rather think, Sir, that the reduction of such a large sum as 3 lakhs is inexpedient. I have myself tabled a motion for the reduction of the amount by 1 lakh. I beg to know if you will permit me to move an amendment, at this stage, to this motion for the substitution of 1 lakh for 3 lakhs.”

Permission having been given for the alteration proposed, the motion as amended was debated upon.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, I do beg the House not to proceed with omnibus reductions of this sort. I should like to say as regards our financial situation that our position is this. In order to carry through the year we shall have to get an overdraft on our bankers, and the limit of that overdraft will be the limit of any further expenditure which we can incur. Now, as regards these omnibus reductions, I ask the House to pause and consider what they really mean by a reduction of the sort following at the end of 50 resolutions which have either not been carried or have been withdrawn. I take it that the meaning is that the House cannot point to any specific items where reductions can be made, and if there are any specific items—(A voice : ‘ There was no time.’)

One hon. gentleman says that there was no time. I ask, Sir, has not the House been three hours less five minutes discussing and pointing out specific items in which the reduction could be made? I repeat, Sir, that if there are any specific items which the House could point to as being unnecessary it was the duty of the House to cut them out. We have put before them a budget of what we considered necessary, and we had cut out of it everything that we could cut out. The Finance Committee have gone through the budget and made their reductions, and the Cabinet have made theirs and if now this resolution is pressed, and if the Government would accept it, the Government would stultify itself. I venture to say, Sir, that it is not fair to the Government to come forward and say ‘ We have tried all the items we can

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

and have withdrawn our motions because we find these items to be necessary and therefore we mean to impose the duty on the Government to do somehow what we have been unable to do.'

"Then again, it has been said that if we cannot do it we can come up with a supplementary grant. It is all very well to say that. But there are two things essential for a supplementary grant. We need the sanction of the House to spend the money, and we need the endorsement of our bankers on our cheque. If we had any balance, we could come forward with a supplementary grant and ask for permission to use the money, and when this House sanctioned it we could draw it. But we have no balance. We are asking our bankers to give us permission to draw up to a certain figure, and once we have got that permission we shall not be able to get further permission to draw. The House have already made several of these lump deductions, 5 lakhs under 'Land Revenue,' some more under 'Law and Justice' and under other heads. The House now say, if the money left is inadequate we are to bring in a supplementary demand. If we do, the Government of India will reply that they cannot sanction odd grants like this from time to time, and that we should estimate our expenditure properly at the beginning of the year. It will be very difficult to secure the assent of the Government of India to meet the deficit that we have, without adding further to it for the purpose of a series of supplementary grants. I therefore ask the House to consider very seriously before they make this general cut. And if they do so, they cut out for good whatever sum they set down. If by any means the deficit can be reduced, nobody would be more glad than I. But as I have already stated, we have done what we can, and the Finance Committee have done what they can, and the House have added a good deal more to the reduction without indicating what items they wish us to cut out. I therefore ask them again, if they have items they object to, to cut them out themselves, but not, when they have failed to find them, to try to put the onus of doing so upon the Government."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"I beg to support this proposition, and I am quite aware of the fact that the hon. the Finance Member would say that the Finance Committee has satisfied itself that it cannot be cut down further. May I point out, Sir, that the Finance Committee, as I pointed out the other day, were under the impression that there would be a reduction of 75 per cent under travelling allowances and contingencies? If that had been done it would have given us about Rs. 45 lakhs, whereas we are told in the budget statement which has been presented that what has been done under these heads is only a cutting down by Rs. 23.14 lakhs. Therefore it is that we have arrived at the conclusion, consistently with the promise held out to the Finance Committee and to the House through the Finance Committee, that further retrenchment in the way of contingencies and travelling allowances might have been done.

"As regards the other objection that various propositions are moved and withdrawn, may I say, with all respect to the hon. the Finance Member, that out of consideration for not embarrassing the Government several of these resolutions were not pressed in the hope and belief that towards the end we might do it by an omnibus cut of one lakh which is a very low percentage and which can very well be done as has been pointed out in the course of this discussion. This has practically been going on in the Legislative Assembly

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

[22nd March 1922]

where the practice of cutting down by 5 per cent was approved and even taking a basis of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent we should have a reduction of about Rs. $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 lakhs in this. But having regard to the fact that the Police Department is a necessity which ought not to be reduced in the present day circumstances, we have shown due consideration and merely confined ourselves to a reduction of one lakh so that this might not embarrass the Government very much as still travelling allowances and contingencies could be cut down.

“Moreover, I wish to draw the attention of the House particularly in this debate, as this is the first time I speak on the police grant, to the policy that has been pursued by the Government with reference to the appointment of higher officers of the Police department. If the Government of this country can be carried on with a Cabinet of seven members of whom five are Indians, why in the Police department alone Indians should not be admitted to the higher posts. Among about 32 district police superintendents, there is only one Indian and out of 36 assistant superintendents and an extra temporary staff of four in Malabar, or out of 40 in all, there are only four Indians. Sir, the position is that the rawest recruit to the ranks of district superintendents of police who comes in to-day may supersede the most respected and the longest service man amongst the Indians, and the latter can only retire in the position of deputy superintendents, however respected they might be. So, in the circumstances, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the policy that is being pursued particularly in this department on which is laid the duty of finding out all that is going on underground and among the people in the dark recesses of the country. If he is an Indian officer he would have the means of going right into the midst of the people and moving among them, whereas the European district superintendent has really to rely upon the reports which are being made to him and which require a long time for verification. The district superintendent should have the opportunity of directly knowing everything as he is responsible for the maintenance of peace in the district and he should be able to get first-hand information which by the policy which has been pursued he is not enabled to do. In that way, if that policy of Indianising the police service to a much larger proportion than is the case at present is adopted, there must be a very large saving and the expenditure of Rs. 172 lakhs might have been reduced by at least one-fourth of that amount. Under the circumstances, I do say that the present policy is not the proper policy. If I am not mistaken, the Police Commission recommended the recruitment of six Indian superintendents of police, but what do we find? There is only one man out of a cadre of 32. With these observations I support the motion for reduction.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I take it that the discussion of this vote is coming to an immediate close. In fact I am not certain that the allotted time has not already expired. It is therefore in my opinion very much to be regretted that the last speaker did not choose an earlier moment for the elaboration of the criticisms to which we have just listened. I should then have had an opportunity of dealing with them. But sprung upon me as they have been at the last moment, at the very end of the vote, it is not possible adequately to meet such attacks.”

The motion of Mr. T. M. Narasimbacharlu as amended, viz., to reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,72,91,079 for Police by one lakh, was put and declared carried.

22nd March 1922]

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson demanded a poll which was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi.
2. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu.
3. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar.
4. " P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu.
5. " K. Gopalakrishnayya.
6. " T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.
7. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.
8. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi.
9. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.
10. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.
11. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon
12. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar.
13. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu.
14. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar.
15. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi.
16. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.
17. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar.
18. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddiyar.
19. Mr. A. Subbarayudu.
20. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
21. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu.
22. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar.
23. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar.
24. Mr. C. Venkata Ranga Reddi.
25. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao.
26. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu.
27. " M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu.

28. Rao Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
29. " A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.
30. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
31. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.
32. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu.
33. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.
34. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.
35. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
36. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo.
37. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
38. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai.
39. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
40. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu.
41. Mr. S. Arpudadaswami Udaiyar.
42. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai.
43. Rao Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas.
44. Mr. A. T. Palmer.
45. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan.
46. Mr. A. D. M. Bayotti Sahib.
47. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur.
48. Mr. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib Bahadur.
49. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur.
50. Munshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur.
51. Saiyid Diwan Abdul-Razaq Sahib Bahadur.
52. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.
53. Mr. G. Vandanam.

Noes.

1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson.
2. " Sir Charles Todhunter.
3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ullah Sahib Bahadur.
4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar.
6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.
7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.
8. Mr. T. E. Moir.
9. Mr. F. J. Richards.

10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton.
11. Mr. R. Littlehailes.
12. Mr. E. Periyanaayagam.
13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.
14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
15. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai.
16. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari.
17. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar.
18. Mr. A. E. Rencontre.
19. Mr. T. Richmond.

Neutral.

1. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur.
2. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu.
3. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.
4. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya.

The motion was carried, 53 voting for, 19 against and 4 remaining neutral.

Motions 503 to 510.

The following motions lapsed, the time allotted for the discussion of this demand having expired :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

503. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,72,91,079 for Police by Rs. 100.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

504. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148.12 lakhs under Demand XIII—Police by Rs. 1,00,000.

[22nd March 1922]

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

505. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148·12 lakhs under Demand XIII—Police by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

506. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148·12 lakhs by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

507. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148·12 lakhs by Rs. 100.*

Mr. V. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—

508. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148·12 lakhs under Demand XIII by Rs. 10 lakhs.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

509. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148·12 lakhs for Police by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

510. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148·12 lakhs by Rs. 1,00,000.*

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 148·12 lakhs, with a reduction of one lakh, was then put to the House and carried.

The grant was made.

The Council adjourned for lunch at 2–10 p.m. and re-assembled at 3 p.m.

DEMAND XIV—SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, I beg to move that a sum not exceeding 49 lakh be granted for Scientific departments (other than Hydro-Electric Surveys).”

Motions 511 and 512.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—

511. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 9,450 for salary and leave allowances of superintendent.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

512. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 46,164 for Provincial museums by Rs. 900.*

Motion 513.

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

513. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 49 lakh under 30. Scientific departments by 100.*

“ I find, Sir, at page 129 of the budget estimate, that a sum of Rs. 1,000 is provided for the Fine Arts Society and a sum of Rs. 1,500 for the Madras Literary Society. Whereas last year we had a sum of Rs. 20,000 provided for grants to local bodies for the maintenance of public libraries, there is no provision for it this year. I find from a note of the Secretary of the Finance Department that it has not been possible for the hon. Minister to make any provision in regard to these libraries on account of financial stringency.

22nd March 1922] [Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu]

When we have an allotment of 49 lakh under the head 'Scientific Departments,' I do not think the hon. Minister is justified in cutting down the expenditure in regard to such a useful object as the equipment of village libraries by local bodies and municipalities. I submit, Sir, last year or the year before last a resolution of this House was accepted by the Government and provision was intended to be made in the budget of 1920-21 but as the scheme was not yet ready nothing could be done. Last year, however, my hon. friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao, drew the attention of the House and a provision was made of 20,000 in the budget and I hoped that that provision would be continued. I see there is absolutely no reason for the omission of the provision and I wish the hon. the Minister tries to find, if not Rs. 20,000, some provision at least and continue to provide year after year to help the local bodies in equipping themselves with libraries."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, no one will be more pleased than myself if I am able to make some provision to help the libraries in the villages. I know the library scheme is developing in the Telugu country and in the southern districts, and there are many workers in the cause of libraries. I had also the pleasure of presiding at one of the Libraries' Conferences and I am much interested in the development of the scheme. It was not possible for me to obtain any help from the Finance Department with reference to this particular development. I would be very glad if I could secure in the course of the year any funds and if the head of the Educational Department was able to find anything also by re-appropriation from his budget. I am sure we shall then be able to consider such cases whether in the north or in the south as would come for scrutiny and it may be possible for us to help the libraries which are doing excellent work in some districts."

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—"With the sympathetic attitude taken by the hon. Minister and with the assurance given by him, I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 49 lakh under Demand XIV—Scientific Departments was then put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XV—EDUCATION (EUROPEAN).

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I have the honour to move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding 9.65 lakhs under Demand XV—European Education."

Motion 514.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—"Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion:—

514. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,92,000 for the provincialization of the Lawrence Memorial school, Levedale, by 1 lakh.*

"I do so, Sir, in pursuance of a policy which I shall try to enforce on this House and on this Government as long as I have the tongue in my mouth and voice in my throat, the policy that the Government should not saddle themselves with educational institutions if they can unless they have no other go. I do not want to enter at present into the merits or demerits of Government institutions. I shall confine myself to the motion before us. I have

[Mr. A. T. Palmer]

[22nd March 1922]

been trying to find out something about this institution, the Lawrence Memorial school at Lovedale, and I have been able to get hold of a directory of 1908. I am afraid it is an ancient book but I was able to get only that book to give me some information in regard to this institution. I was ransacking the reports of last year on the budget discussion and I could not get any information from it. The institution in question was founded as early as 1858, primarily for the benefit of European lads and girls who were left orphans and it was well supported by big people, by the Commander-in-Chief, by the Bishop of Madras and many other influential men. I think there is also a press called the Lawrence Asylum Press for the benefit of this institution. The institution has a very large staff and I have no doubt it has been doing very good work. I cannot understand what made the institution go abegging to the Imperial Government. I do not know the intervening history but what I learnt was that some two years ago it was not able to manage itself and wanted the aid of the Government of India for its upkeep and the Imperial Government have taken up the institution and have placed the required funds at the disposal of the Madras Government. If, as I hear, this institution is not a burden on provincial funds, I have no complaint at all but if it is to be one of those instances, where like the camel which puts its nose first and then thrusts its whole body in, if we will have to incur greater and greater expenditure as time goes on I should certainly press this resolution."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" This institution, Sir, enjoys a recurring Imperial grant of 2·30 lakhs which has now been merged in Provincial funds. It enjoys a further income from endowments and fees of 92 lakh per annum. There is also a sum of 1·27 lakhs set apart for its benefit from an Imperial grant given towards European education some years ago which has not been expended. Finally large grants for capital expenditure have been promised by the Government of India, to an aggregate amount of, I think 3·22 lakhs. The order directing the provincialization of the school was passed only very recently and the exact details have not yet been fully worked out. That is the reason, Sir, why the provision takes the shape of a lump grant in this budget. The question of the adequacy of the lump grant has recently been under further examination and the decision arrived at in the Cabinet on Sunday last was that it is necessary to raise it from 2·92 to 3·10 lakhs, a figure still nearly Rs. 20,000 less than the proposals of the Committee which supervise the management of the institution, but generally based on the revised estimate for the current year. I do not propose, Sir, to go into the past history of the school for I think it must be well-known to the Members of this House that the school is founded in memory of the great Sir Henry Lawrence, and has been taken care of by the Government of India since his death in pursuance of a special request to that effect in his will. If any hon. Member of this House is interested in the details of the foundation of this school, he will find them in the annual reports of the institution and I may add, Sir, that having been honoured with a request to preside at the annual prize giving in 1920 I took advantage of the occasion to set out more fully the personal connexion of Sir Henry Lawrence and his family with these institutions, and the newspapers were kind enough to publish what I said for soldiers' children. If Mr. Palmer or any other gentleman wants to know the early history of the school and the circumstances under which its management has been taken over from the Government of India by the

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

Government of Madras, I shall be happy to give him full information. The matter has been under correspondence, I think, for something like three years and one of the facts which deferred the final settlement was this very question of the financial issue. The Government of Madras were anxious to ensure that the transfer should be effected without involving any additional burden on Provincial funds. The arrangements to that end underwent careful scrutiny at the hands of my hon. Colleague, Sir Charles Todhunter. I cannot go into the details at this moment but I may assure the House that they are generally satisfactory and that so far as the allotment for the next year is concerned every penny of it can be met from funds placed at the disposal of the Government of Madras by the Imperial Government."

Mr. T. RICHMOND :—"Sir, I must admit I was considerably puzzled and to some extent alarmed when I heard the hon. the Mover
3-15 p.m. saying that he was going to enforce some policy on this House so long as he had any voice in his throat. I must admit after hearing the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson that I was surprised why the hon. the Mover should have gone for information to an old edition of the Lawrence Asylum almanac. I however have some personal knowledge of the institution which I know has been doing very useful work and I think it was a very proper step on the part of the Government to have made this provision."

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—"I did not question that, Sir. I request permission to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 515.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

515. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 50,400 for building grants to non-Government secondary schools by Rs. 25,000.*

"The reason, Sir, why I gave notice of this motion was this. While the provision made in the next year's budget for building grants to European non-Government secondary schools is Rs. 50,000, the provision for building grants to other schools, which are very large in number is only Rs. 10,800. It seems to me, Sir, that considering both the importance and the number of the other institutions concerned, it requires an explanation, and a satisfactory explanation too, as to why Rs. 50,000 should be provided for the European schools and Rs. 10,800 only for all the other schools together. If there is a satisfactory explanation for that, I do not want to press the matter further."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"There is a quite satisfactory explanation, Sir. The principle relating to the entry of these grants is identical with that which has been applied in the case of building grants to non-European schools. I understand from my hon. Colleague the Minister that the total sum under that head will shortly be raised by 5½ lakhs. The principle is that building grants should next year be given only in cases where there has been a direct or indirect promise to find funds in the case of works already started and in progress. Now of this Rs. 50,400, all but Rs. 6,400 relates to one institution, the St. George's Homes at Kaity. The building operations there have been going on under the direct supervision of the Public Works Department whose services have been lent free of

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

the usual percentage contribution for the last two or three years. I am told the buildings are likely to be completed before the close of this month, but the actual amount due cannot be paid until later. The sum in question is Rs. 44,000 and this will leave a balance for building grants to other European schools of only Rs. 6,400."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I am glad to hear, Sir, that 5½ lakhs is going to be provided for schools, other than European schools, for building grants. So, I do not press this motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"May I ask the hon. the Minister, Sir, where that 5½ lakhs is to be found in the budget?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"It is not to be found in the budget. In relation to an interpretation of an order in Council, viz., whether specific promises were made with reference to the allotments that were made for 1921-22, the Finance Department naturally raised an objection that no grants should be given unless there was a specific promise. In accordance with that ruling of the Finance Department, the head of the Education Department, the Director of Public Instruction, was obliged to surrender about Rs. 5½ lakhs. When the matter came up before the Government, they reconsidered the whole matter and said that in the case of buildings already in progress, the amount might be reallocated. So, a reallocation was made by the Government of the 5½ lakhs that was surrendered on account of the rule and a liberal construction has now been put upon it by the Government."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Does it mean that my hon. Friend is making a supplementary grant by allotting this amount for building grants for 1922-23?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Yes, it will be taken credit of."
The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 516.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion:—

516. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,75,000 for boarding grants by Rs. 50,000.*

"Sir, this motion also has been tabled to show the disparity that exists in the allotment made for European education and for the education of the other people. The boarding grant that is provided in the budget for the year 1921-22 for European schools was Rs. 1,22,500, whereas in the revised estimate for 1921-22 there is a provision of Rs. 1,75,000, which is about Rs. 50,000 over and above the budget estimate for the year. On the other hand, turning to page 140 we find that the budget estimate for hostel grants for the old year was Rs. 37,000, while in the revised estimate it has gone up to Rs. 57,000. But in the budget estimate for the next year there is absolutely no provision whatever for hostel grants. It seems to me, Sir, that it is a matter requiring the scrutiny of the House, and I think that this matter of providing such a large amount for European education and leaving nothing at all for any other education should again be explained; and if a satisfactory explanation will be forthcoming, I do not intend to press my motion."

22nd March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"The explanation, Sir, in this case is eminently satisfactory. I do not propose to enter into any comparison with the provision made for hostel grants in a branch of the educational budget which is not under my control. That is a matter with which my hon. Colleague, the Minister for Education, will deal. But I do proceed to justify the provision made for boarding of grants next year, and I propose to cite as my first witness the hon. Mover himself; for, I find that his name comes as 23rd in a list of not less than 62 persons who, on the 24th March last year, voted in favour of entering in this year's budget a sum of Rs. 70,000 for the purpose of revising the rates of boarding grants in European schools. That lump sum of Rs. 70,000 is shown at page 136 under the budget estimate for 1921-22, and if Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar will add that on to the figure in the budget estimate at page 137, he will find that the total budget estimate for these boarding grants during the current year comes to Rs. 1,92,500. He will thus find that the revised estimate shows a saving of Rs. 17,500 and that the provision for the coming year's budget is identical with the revised estimate."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"May I ask the hon. the Minister for Education whether any sum has been provided for hostels attached to Indian educational institutions and whether he will please make a statement on the subject?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, is that inquiry in order at this stage? I imagine that any inquiry regarding hostel grants under the transferred budget should be made in the course of the discussion of that grant."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The point raised by the hon. the Home Member is this: As the Council is at present dealing with European education, any enquiry which the hon. Member may have to make of the Minister in regard to non-European education will not be in order in this discussion. Will the hon. Member explain how such an inquiry is relevant to the consideration of the present motion? Of course any inquiry the answer to which would be relevant for disposing of this motion would be justifiable. But the hon. Member has not yet told us why he wants the information now."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"May I ask, Sir, whether the item under discussion at present is votable or not? Before giving our votes in regard to this grant, we would also like to know the reason for the disparity in the treatment meted out to the hostels attached to other schools."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Last year when this motion was before the House some hon. Members made remarks to the effect that if boarding grants are made by the State for one class of people there should be provision made for such grants to other classes of people as well. That is perhaps what is at the back of my hon. Friend Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi when he raised the point and asked the hon. the Minister for Education whether any grant is going to be provided for Indian orphans also. If we could have information on this point, we will be better able to make up our mind in giving our vote."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, the question of general policy as to whether the State should commit itself to boarding grants was raised last year and I should be surprised if any inquiry as to whether this system of allotting public funds for the boarding charges

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

[22nd March 1922]

of students should be considered irrelevant. I think that on this question of providing funds for the boarding of students, however necessitous, some amount of criticism was levelled as to the consequences of such a step. Therefore my hon. Friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi is perfectly right in raising the question as regards the treatment of other classes of orphans. My hon. Friend feels that if this is allowed to one class of children it is perfectly natural to raise the question whether as a policy it should not be extended to all. That is at the back of my hon. Friend's inquiry and I trust, Sir, that even last year apprehensions were raised as to whether in our educational expenditure we should go so far as to commit ourselves to paying for board of children and if so how far we should go. That is the point of the inquiry and that is the reason why my hon. Friend has put that question. I do not wish to raise any other question except the question of the policy involved."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I think, Sir, it is a very legitimate question in considering this matter. We regret we are unable to make any provision in the case of Indian students, because the demand was not pressing. We thought that if there were to be pressing demands in this matter we might be able to provide by reappropriation of grants. That is the situation. No doubt as the hon. Members of Council will see there is a large boarding grant for European schools. But pressing demands not having been forthcoming from other quarters, we thought we could provide for these at a later stage and therefore the amount is not put down in the budget. However, if there should be any pressing demand we are prepared to meet it."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—" Are we to understand that there had been no applications forthcoming from the Indian institutions?"

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—" May I say, Sir, that I caused inquiries to be made with regard to this question? Various applications were submitted to me, I had them under my investigation and the question was submitted to the Government for their orders. Government are at the present moment still considering the question as to whether boarding grants should be granted to the applicants and if so under what conditions. When those conditions are laid down, then Sir, and only then can we make some provision in the budget. As the hon. the Minister has pointed out the amount that has been demanded for the coming year will be comparatively small and from the relatively large amount of the educational budget it may be found quite possible to obtain the money required by reappropriation although it is very difficult at this time of the year to point out any definite reappropriation from which the amount may be met.

" There is one other point. There appears to have been some confusion with regard to the hostel grants and the boarding grants. Hostel grants for which budget provision is made in the educational budget are grants which are made for the purpose of building hostels for students. They are therefore of the nature of a capital charge. Boarding grants on the other hand are grants made to help to meet the recurring charges that are incurred in the maintenance of these pupils in educational orphanages."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" May I elicit, Sir, some information in regard to certain points connected with this subject? The first point is : What are these boarding grants for? Are they only messing charges; or do they include other charges, such as maintenance of dormitories,

22nd March 1922 | [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

tuition fees, etc. ? Are all these included in this comprehensive term of boarding ? Secondly, I wish to know whether the hon. the Home Member can state, approximately, the total number of children that are benefited by this grant. Thirdly whether this help is by way of grant-in-aid to private institutions to supplement their contributions ; or does it cover the total boarding charges ? These are the three points on which I wish to have information."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—" I should very much like to have notice of these questions so that I may have before me to present before this Council absolutely accurate figures. I regret that I cannot state the exact number, but if my hon. Friend will give me notice or ask either publicly by an interpellation or demi-officially, I shall furnish the information. I may say, Sir, that on account of the children for whom grants are received the managements receive the grants-in-aid of their expenditure under rules as specifically laid down in the code. A specific grant is made in aid of boarding charges. This amount does not cover the total charges. It is given in aid of the boarding charges. I refer the hon. Member to the code of regulations for European schools under which I am compelled to administer orders of Government."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—" If I speak on this motion it is not with an idea of cutting down any of these grants allotted for the purpose of feeding the Anglo-Indian children. It is only to draw the attention of the hon. the Home Member to the speech which he made during the last year's budget when this very same question was discussed in this Council and to the very carefully worded promise which he held out on that occasion. He stated in the course of the debate that an examination would be made of the case for giving grants for similar institutions for destitute orphans of the Indian community and held out that promise as an olive branch. In the course of that debate I even told the hon. the Home Member that I would give the names of institutions where Indian orphans and Anglo-Indian orphans are maintained and where the same conditions under which the Anglo-Indian orphans are maintained do prevail. Further, Sir, I may go to the extent of saying that in the same school both these orphans are being maintained but only the Anglo-Indians are paid by Government and the Indians are not paid. I may remind the hon. the Home Member that last year when the hon. the Home Member was in Ootacamund I brought one or two instances of this kind where the Indian orphans are housed under similar conditions as those of European orphans. All these things I brought to his notice and I do not know whether he remembers them."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Yes."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—" Thanks. He was good enough to promise me consideration. Now I hear from the Director of Public Instruction that an investigation has been set afoot and they are trying to do the work. For the last one year nothing has been done. That is the complaint we here make on behalf of the poor Indian orphans. We do not want to cut down the grants of the Anglo-Indian orphans. But I would like that at least the half-hearted promise of the Home Member in dealing with this case is fulfilled. I submit, Sir, there would have been no difficulty if the Government had really wanted to carry out the promise. If surely the hon. the Director of Public Instruction had only taken a little more care and a little more zest

[Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai] [22nd March 1922]

surely he would have found out that there are so many orphanages in which the Indian orphans are maintained in the same conditions as these Anglo-Indian orphans. So far as the point raised by Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu is concerned I can state from my own personal knowledge that the amounts granted to the Anglo-Indian orphans do not exactly cover the charges but they go even beyond them. In all these matters, Sir, it is too late for the Government to say after one year, 'we have tried, we have not been able to do anything in the matter'. I was sorry to hear from the hon. the Home Member and the hon. the Director of Public Instruction that the demand was not pressing."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Pressed."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"Yes. Exactly."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—"I do not remember saying that the demand was not pressing. What I said is, if I remember right, that there was not a great demand, that is to say, the number of Indians who satisfied the conditions was not so great as the number of Anglo-Indians. That is the point."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"Thanks. Probably the hon. the Director of Public Instruction does not know that half of the boarding institutions in which Anglo-Indian orphans are maintained contain Indian orphans also."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—"I am aware that they maintain a large number of Indian orphans."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"If he was aware of the fact what is the meaning of the investigation that is being made for the last one year. That is the question I put to the hon. the Director of Public Instruction. Now, I will take the correction of the hon. the Home Member that these demands were not pressed. What could these institutions do? They send up applications. They bring it to the notice of the Government. Does the hon. the Home Member or the Director of Public Instruction expect these managers to be dinning them day in and day out with letters and correspondence. If that is the way in which they are going to interpret, all that I can say is that the Government is not doing its duty. I wish now at least, Sir, the Government will wake from its stupor and distribute the grants with justice and equity. I am not here to say that these demands ought to be cut down."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I find myself, Sir, enjoying the full benefits of diarchy, for a reserved allotment is being attacked on the ground that it is not supplemented by transferred allotment for similar purposes (laughter). But I do think that Mr. Arumainatham Pillai is unduly distressed. It is perfectly true that in the debate last year—though I did not give any specific assurance—I did indicate a disposition to cause an inquiry to be made. And, as a matter of fact, I did direct that attention should be drawn to the question of boarding grant for Indian orphanages and ask that investigation should be put in hand. But the further pursuit of that inquiry devolved on the Ministry for Education. In the earlier stages this was in the hands of our late lamented colleague Mr. Subbarayulu Reddiyar and it is only recently that the matter has come before Mr. Patro. Investigations and changes of this description do take a certain amount of time and we cannot expect changes in the rules to be brought about immediately. It is possible that this particular change might have

3-45 p.m.

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

been carried out more expeditiously and I for one should not have had the least objection to this being done. But it is necessary to examine what the practical financial effect of such a change would be and such an examination does take time. I was glad to hear Mr. Arumainatham Pillai say that he did not wish on the score of delay in dealing with the case of Indian orphanages to move for any reduction in the grant for Anglo-Indian orphanages which are dealt with under this head. Most of Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu's inquiries were really answered in the opening paragraphs of my speech on the resolution about this matter on 24th March last—

'These grants,' I said then, 'are not given indiscriminately to the occupants of the boarding houses at European or Anglo Indian schools but only to destitute orphans who have to obtain a certificate of destitution from the magistrate of the district in the mufassal and from the Chief Presidency Magistrate in the case of the City of Madras. It is a rule that no boy over 16 and no girl over the age of 18 shall be eligible; and no scholar reading beyond Standard VII can receive any grant, unless in very exceptional cases sanctioned by the department.'

"Last year what we were debating was the question whether the old rates of Rs. 10 in Madras and Rs. 8 in the mufassal should not be enhanced and we came to the conclusion that these rates, which were fixed many years before, ought, in consideration of the increased cost of living, to be increased by at least 50 per cent. It is that increase which is the ultimate cause of the provision we are now discussing. I pointed out that several deserving orphanages would have to be closed if the additional sum was not placed at their disposal. I deprecated then, and I am glad to say that the majority of the House agreed with me in deprecating, any conclusion which was likely to result in throwing numbers of destitute orphans, indiscriminately on to the streets. If the same conditions apply in regard to Indian orphanages, I for one am fully prepared to support the application of similar provisions to such cases. But, as I observed last year, 'boarding institutions for Indians are comparatively rare', and to what extent Indian orphanages stand in need of the same help as European or Indian orphanages, I do not know. That is a matter which the Director of Public Instruction and his staff are engaged in investigating. I also pointed out last year that Government were doing something in the way of meeting boarding charges of Indian orphans in the case of the industrial settlements. The provision we are discussing does not relate to the question of grants to hostels. That is quite a distinct issue, a question of building grants. These boarding grants come under a different category. The real answer is an answer which in this system of diarchy it does not fall to me to give. For it is the transferred part of the Government which should provide similar grants for Indian orphanages where the circumstances justify it."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I do not think any one will ask for a reduction of the boarding grants already provided for in the case of European and Anglo-Indian schools. But the point which has really given rise for anxiety and some sort of dissatisfaction in the minds of several of us is that, notwithstanding the fact that one year has elapsed since our last discussion on the subject, nothing has yet been done to help Indian orphanages during the course of the year. The question is a very simple one on the face of it. We were told that the Government and the Director of Public Instruction had information about the existence of Indian orphanages deserving such help; and if that information was available, why it was not possible for them to come to a decision on this simple question even after such

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [22nd March 1922]

a long time, passes my comprehension. I find no justification for this. Since this matter has now been brought to their notice, let it be hoped that no time will be lost and that steps will be taken to rectify this omission even before the close of the current year. I do not think we can go to the public with any sense of gratification that, while we have been voting for grants for these Anglo-Indian institutions, nothing has been done in the case of the Indian institutions. While I do not think it is necessary to press this motion for reduction at this stage, still I think this discussion would have served a very useful purpose, if only the Director of Public Instruction would make his recommendation soon and see that the omission is made good in the case of Indian orphanages, even before the close of this year."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—"May I correct one misapprehension, Sir? It is the statement that nothing has been done till now in the case of Indian orphanages. As a matter of fact, my inspectors—Government inspectors—have collected information; they have made inquiries; they have submitted reports to me: I have already, some time ago, submitted my recommendations to the Government and I have advised Government—I am not at liberty to state what my advice to the Government is—but I have advised Government and I am at the present moment awaiting Government orders. I just wish to state that it is a misapprehension to state that nothing has been done, when the position is that this department is doing its level best to hurry on things and to make recommendations in accordance with what is known as the general policy both of the Government and of this Legislative Council. If Members would only come and ask about the state of these various things either by form of questions or by demi-official letters to me, I shall be able to give them the fullest information and they will know what the exact position is and this would save a great deal of discussion in this Council."

Rev. W. MESTON :—"Sir, I simply beg to confirm what the Director of Public Instruction has said. During the past year some of us have had occasion to approach him in connexion with boarding grants and have met with the most sympathetic treatment. We understand that certain schemes regarding boarding grants are under consideration and we await the result of these with interest."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, the course of discussion has brought out very many things which require to be looked into first by the Government and then, if necessary, by the Council. Applications from Indian orphanages, it is said, have been received but not disposed of. We find no provision made this year in the budget for Indian orphanages. That shows, Sir, that nothing has yet been settled with regard to these Indian orphanages and it is not known whether they would get any help at all in the near future. Then, Sir, it was stated that these boarding grants are given as stipends in European schools and they are in a different position from the hostels which are managed in connexion with other schools. I believe last year when the question was raised, a number of hon. Members referred to the question of hostels and they said that these hostels ought to be helped by the Government. I was one of those who supported the Government at the time and I did so on the understanding that the Government were going to help these hostels and they were going to be liberal towards meeting the expenses of these hostels. Now we find that no provision has been made for these hostels. It is said that the hostel grants mentioned are

22nd March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

only for building grants and not for the upkeep of the hostels. That is a question which requires the consideration of the Minister. He will have to frame a bold policy with regard to it. Otherwise, the Council will have to take up this question also.

"So far as the grants now debated on are concerned, as the hon. the Home Member has said, it was not my intention that any portion of the community should suffer because the Government have committed a mistake. The hon. the Home Member has been referring more than once to diarchy. Well, we see the result of the diarchy. Under the diarchy the reserved portion is able to act in any way they like and allot as much money as possible for the departments under their control, whereas the transferred departments are not able to make themselves felt."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I draw attention to the fact, Sir, that these allotments are made after the sanction of the Legislative Council? "

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I am only referring to what the hon. the Home Member said. I say that the provisions made in the budget for the transferred and reserved halves show the weakness of the system. Well, we see that the result of the diarchy is not in favour of the transferred departments at all. I do hope that the transferred departments will get better treatment in future and that institutions under the transferred departments will get better consideration at least hereafter. So, Sir, as I said already, it is not my intention that the Anglo-Indian community should suffer for the mistakes made by the Government and I have not changed my opinion from that I held last year, viz., that the poor boys though they belong to the Anglo-Indian community and come under the reserved department should not be made to suffer. Therefore, I do not want to press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 517.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

517. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 26,900 for European schools.*

Motion 518.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

518. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,21,600 for European education by Rs. 100.*

" I would invite the attention of the House to the figures published at page 149 of the budget, where we find the sums provided for inspection of schools under different agencies. It appears to me that the agency is far too much for the actual needs of the case. The number of schools appears to be 92. Of these, more than one school are located in the same place. So far as the public instruction in the Presidency is concerned, the proportion which the expenditure under inspection bears to the total expenditure under public instruction is 3.63 per cent. But I fear that compared with the total cost on education under this head, the expenditure on inspection would be found to be very heavy indeed. I do not see the need for so much inspecting agency. There was an assistant inspector last year and I think the

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [22nd March 1922]

same assistant inspector with a woman assistant inspectress provided in the budget would both be able to do the necessary inspection satisfactorily. Further, I notice a proposal was made in 1912, which has not been given any attention to by the department. The Conference on the education of the domiciled community in India held at Simla in July, 1912 resolved that concentration of schools was desirable wherever possible. So far, no steps have been taken in Madras to give effect to this resolution. This is from the report of public instruction in the Madras Presidency for the year 1920. In this connexion I would like to suggest that the number of pupils who receive boarding grants should be mentioned in the report for the information of all concerned. So, for the reasons that economy is possible, that the inspecting staff is far in excess of the needs of the case and that the proposals already made for reduction have not been given effect to, and in order further to mark our sense of dis-satisfaction with the non-provision of any amount for Indian boarding institutions, I beg to move that this grant be reduced by a sum of Rs. 100."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I wish the hon. Member had had the courtesy to give me previous intimation of the point he was going to raise, for then I should have been much more fully prepared to deal with it. As a matter of fact, I have before me a lengthy exposition of the case for inspecting staff."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I should like to correct the hon. the Home Member and say that it was not due to any intentional discourtesy that I did not intimate to him the points I was going to raise."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I do not suggest for one moment that the hon. Member was intentionally discourteous. I know him far too well to suppose that he would be guilty of deliberate discourtesy to anybody. But there are discourtesies due to want of thought. The House must recognize that the Member in charge of a portfolio is at a distinct disadvantage if topics of which he has no information are raised. I am not prepared to say off-hand what steps have been taken in pursuance of resolution passed in the Simla Conference with regard to the amalgamation of institutions. It is quite likely that the Director of Public Instruction will be able to say something about that and I have no doubt that he will be able to deal more fully with the question of inspection and inspecting staff than I propose to do. All that I propose to say on the subject is that we are satisfied that as things stand at present a special inspecting staff for these European schools is necessary. They differ very much from the ordinary Indian schools, differ in respect of curricula, differ in respect of the type of pupils, differ in respect of the type of examinations: in fact the differences are so many that I cannot enumerate them fully. But the general conclusion is that special qualifications are required of the inspector and his staff. As a rule we desire, and very naturally, to allot a European member of the Indian Educational Service for the inspection of these schools. This is not always possible, but that is our idea. As to the quantity of work which is in issue it is quite a mistake to suppose that judged statistically it is any less than that devolving upon the average inspector of Indian schools. The figures put before me suggest that the reverse is the case and that the average volume of work that falls on the shoulders of the inspector of European schools is larger."

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

"I think the third and the last point which the hon. Member took was that we have failed to supply him and the House with statistics as to the number of persons in receipt of boarding grants. I will present him with a simple arithmetical problem, and if he will devote a minute or two to it, he will arrive at maximum and minimum figures within which the figure he desires will be found. I think I mentioned that the old rates were Rs. 10 and Rs. 8. The new rates are Rs. 15 and Rs. 12 according as the pupils are in Madras city or in the mufassal. The revised estimate figure is Rs. 1,75,000. If this be divided by 12 and by 15, the results will show how many pupils are furnished with boarding grants at Rs. 12 per head and how many at Rs. 15 per head. The figure which the hon. Member wishes to arrive at will be somewhere between those two figures."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I do not say that the total number of inspectors should be reduced. There may be two people as at present. All that I want is that instead of an inspector on Rs. 1,000 a month, there may be an assistant inspector on a salary of Rs. 300 a month."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—"The pay of inspector is nonvotable."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"All that I wish to say is this : when you want an inspecting agency, is it not possible to utilize the services of a cheaper agency when available? I do not say that the pay of inspectors should be cut down. I wish to point out that it is unnecessary to spend so much on mere inspection. I therefore press my motion."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—"Sir, the hon. Member desires information with regard to the steps that have been taken in the amalgamation of institutions. I might give him the information that it was only within the last fortnight that I had a conference in my office of the representatives of managers of three schools in Madras and we discussed together the possibilities of amalgamation. It was put forward at that conference that instead of having an amalgamation, it might be more desirable to throw open European schools to larger numbers of Indians who desire to come in and that, Sir, is another problem which is receiving my attention. That is a problem which is also being discussed by the Government of India and its advisory board. I may say that I have at the present moment a large file in that connexion and I should have been able to advise the Government on the matter a week ago had it not been for the present meeting of the Legislative Council. I hope in the course of the next fortnight to be able to submit definite recommendations to the Government with regard to the position of European schools with reference to Indian schools. I should just mention this fact that if the hon. Member had only taken the trouble to let me know in advance the point on which he desired information, he could have easily obtained additional information."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, as the hon. Member wishes to press the resolution and as he has done so on a fresh point namely that it might be possible to replace the inspector by an assistant inspector, it becomes incumbent upon me to give a little more information on that aspect of the case. In the first instance I would say that as the officer ultimately responsible for the general control of European schools I should certainly wish that the officer who is charged with the inspection of the class of institutions that come within my sphere should be of high status. I certainly could not

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

accept as authoritative the views of an officer of the grade of assistant inspector of schools in the case of a large institution like the Lawrence Memorial school which has just come under our control. There are, I believe, 500 boys in that school, to say nothing of girls, and the standard of education is high. That is not a class of institution which can properly be inspected only by an assistant inspector. I do not think that if the hon. Mover ponders over this, he will seriously urge his proposal. Then I must draw his attention to the comparative figures. I do not wish to rely on the technical question whether the post of an inspector is votable or non-votable; I rest my case on the fact that an officer of the rank of an inspector is clearly required to discharge the duties without which the Government cannot properly exercise supervision over European institutions in this presidency. If the hon. Member refers to the details given at page 149 under Detailed Account 31-E of the Civil Budget Estimate, he will see that whereas last year we had both an inspector and an assistant inspector of schools we have dispensed with the assistant inspector this year, not because an assistant inspector is not necessary, but because we have decided in lieu to employ a woman assistant inspector on a temporary basis in order to deal specially with girl pupils. There are a very large number of boys and girls receiving education in European schools and the absolute minimum of the inspecting staff for that purpose is one man and one woman. I have already given reasons why the man must be an officer of high status. I venture again to appeal to the hon. Mover of this nominal reduction to withdraw his motion if it is merely based on the question of the inspecting staff."

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Before I withdraw I should like to say one or two words. I was aware of the fact mentioned by the hon. the Home Member that there were last year two inspectors and that there was no woman inspector. The hon. the Home Member stated that there was only one school and I do not see any reason why there should be two inspectors, one man and one woman. I wish to know whether both of them are required to supervise a single school."

THE HON. SIR LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Pardon me, Sir, there are many European institutions which require to be supervised."

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"The hon. the Home Member mentioned only one, the Lawrence Memorial school."

THE HON. SIR LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I mentioned only the most important of them all."

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I think my purpose has been served in drawing the attention of the hon. the Home Member to the matter of the inspecting staff. I therefore withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 9.65 lakhs under Demand XV—European Education was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XVI—EDUCATION (NON-EUROPEAN).

THE HON. RAO BAHADUR A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 143.10 lakhs for Demand XVI—Education (Non-European)."

22nd March 1922]

Motion 519.

4-15 p.m.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

519. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 85,500 for grants to the University by Rs. 12,000.*

" Sir, I beg to apologize to my hon. Friend on the left the Member for the University and I wish to state the circumstances under which I am justified in bringing forward this motion. The defects and irregularities about which I complain are not due to any fault of the hon. Member but rather that he suffered from some of them himself. The particular circumstances which prompted me to table this resolution are to be found in the proceedings of this Council for the 21st January 1922. My hon. Friend Mr. P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu asked the hon. the Minister for Education what the duties are of Professor Rao Sahib S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar, University lecturer; who scrutinizes his work and for what period his appointment was sanctioned; whether he had written any books and whether they had been published either by the Government or by the University; and whether he was given special permission to publish books and appropriate their sale-proceeds. A harmless question from a representative of the tax-payer who is called upon to pay from the revenues of the State to the tune of Rs. 85,000 to the University. The answer to the first part of the question :

" 'What the duties are of Professor Rao Sahib S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar, University lecturer' is: 'the duties of the professor are to deliver lectures of a specialised character in Indian History and Archaeology with a view to supplement the ordinary instruction in the affiliated colleges and to make researches.'

" 'To the second part 'who scrutinizes his work and for what period his appointment is sanctioned' is: 'the Government have no information in regard to the first part of the question. The professor's appointment has been sanctioned for a period of ten years in all which will terminate with 31st October 1924.'

" 'To the third part 'whether he has written any books and whether they have been published either by the University or by the Government': 'the answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The books have not been published by the Government and the Government have no definite information as to whether they have been published by the University.'

" 'The answer to the last part 'whether he is given special permission to publish books and appropriate their sale-proceeds' is: 'the Government have no information'. It is a very unenviable position for the Government to say that they have no information. I then asked 'whether the information which is said to be not available will be obtained and placed before the Council.' The hon. the Minister was good enough to tell me: 'Information will be obtained from the University to whom reference has been made.' I then said in words which now turn out to be prophetic 'if the Government could not get the information private members cannot have facilities to obtain it'.

" 'In pursuance of the promise then made, the hon. the Minister has apparently addressed the University and in answer thereto he has received a reply of which owing to the courtesy of the Minister I have been furnished with a copy. This is the letter received from the University.

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

[22nd March 1922]

'With reference to Government Memorandum No. 184B-1, dated the 20th January last, requesting the Syndicate to furnish the Government with an account of the work of Dr. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar, University Professor of Indian History and Archaeology, since his appointment, I have the honour, by direction, to furnish Government with copies of the reports of the Syndicate to the Senate during the period of tenure of office of the Professor.

'With reference to Government Memorandum No. 134-B-1, dated the 30th January last,

apparently things are not promptly attended to and a reminder had to be sent

I am directed to invite your attention to the fact that the answers to the question referred to therein involve reference to matters solely within the competence and jurisdiction of the Syndicate and the Senate and to the internal affairs and concerns of the University, of and over which

here the language smacks of the lawyer

the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor and Fellows for the time being have the entire management and superintendence.'

"Sir, after reading this, I am reminded of the solemn vows which the Chancellor takes from the candidates appearing before him for taking the degrees. They are asked to promise amongst other things whether they will comfort themselves with humility and candour. The answer that has been vouchsafed by the University to the hon. the Minister is, I am sorry to say, wanting in those virtues which the candidates for degrees are asked to practise. Sir, if the people who provide the University with funds to pay this Professor are to be told that it is not competent for the tax-payer to enquire and if even the Minister representing the Government is to be told that it is not competent for him to put any question, then to say the least, such a conduct is highly undignified—I won't use a stronger term. (Hear, hear.) Sir, those who pay have a right to ask for an account of the stewardship rendered, whether it be by the University or by any other body and it is the height of impropriety to have vouchsafed such an answer. We asked for bread in the shape of information and they have given us a stone in the shape of reports of the Syndicate to the Senate. It now transpires that even the Government have not been able to extort information from this superior body, viz., the University. To such an institution are we to pay Rs. 85,000 of the tax-payer's money without having a right to exercise any control—not so much to exercise control as even to get information as to what is being done with the money?

"Sir, there are other things about which we have much to say regarding the University. I have referred to the fact that my hon. Friend to my left (Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi) is not responsible for it—rather he has suffered by it. I am sorry to be personal in my observations. When he was Inspector-General of Education of Mysore he stood in competition with another gentleman unconnected with Education except probably by publishing books adjusted to the University curriculum. The University is so constituted that Mr. Reddi had no chance; but that some body else not very much connected with the University had the better chance. That shows that the foundation and the superstructure are not all that is desirable. It looks as if the whole thing should be demolished and a new structure built on the ruins of the old. The expenditure we are incurring on the various works of architecture may be utilized in the reconstruction of the University. It is with that object that I move the reduction of the allotment of Rs. 85,500 for grants to University by Rs. 12,000 which represents

22nd March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

the contribution to the University Professor for Indian History which is being paid no doubt by monthly instalments of Rs. 1,000 to the Professor whose work is kept hidden under a bushel."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"I am in a peculiar position. I have to oppose the motion for reduction of allotment Rs. 85,500 for grants to the University by Rs. 12,000 moved by my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar. I do so on this consideration. I do admit that the University requires reorganization and I think the hon. the Minister for Education has it in his own power to do so by bringing in a Bill in this Council for the reorganization of the University. But I do not for a moment concede the position taken up by the hon. Member Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar. The University is, in my opinion, an autonomous body, and I think it should be once for all settled on the floor of the House that the University, even though it receives a grant from the Government, is not responsible to the Government. That position is well understood in western countries. We are borrowing from the west in the organization of democratic institutions, and I hope that we will bear in mind the fact that only under such a policy that the Universities thrive and that the members belonging to the University should be free to carry on research without being hindered by even the Legislative Council. The second point is that the hon. Member made a remark about the Professor of History. I am personally acquainted with the Professor of History."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"May I clear a point, Sir? I have not raised the point as to the Professor of History or his work. I am concerned with the answer given by the University to the Government. That is a question of the account of the work of those who are conducting the affairs of the University."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"I think it is very wrong of the Government to have asked for an explanation regarding the work of the University Professor. I am acquainted with his work. Though his work in the opinion of some may not be of a very high order (prolonged laughter), I think that during the period of eight years when he has held this post he has done far better work in research than has been done in the past. The University can certainly take credit to itself for the fact that at last it has given a chance to one of its sons for doing research work to show to the world that there is such a thing as South Indian History. The University has done well in giving him an opportunity of doing this work. I hope the House will bear in mind the principle I put forward, that it is very wrong to think that the Government can control the University, because it gives a certain amount of money. As I have said before, Sir, the University ought to be an autonomous body conducting its affairs without interference from outside." (Hear, hear.)

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—"Sir, I have myself tabled a similar motion. I have nothing more to add to what Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar said. Though my hon. Friend Dr. P. Subbarayan says it is wrong to interfere with the affairs of the University, I believe that so long as we pay money we have a right to interfere."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Mr. President, before proceeding to deal with the more serious points raised by the hon. Mover, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, I should like to say a word in regard to the personal matters that he mentioned. He suggested that I suffered under the system. I was

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[22nd March 1922]

wondering what my suffering consisted in. If in a certain election I was defeated by a certain candidate who in the opinion of my hon. Friend was not better than I, I candidly regard it as no personal suffering. In the second place, the system has nothing to do with the matter. The other candidate's qualifications were more responsible for my defeat. There are two or three points of very serious portend indeed that my hon. Friend raised on this occasion. The first one is that the University had sheltered itself under its rights and rules and refused to supply certain information asked for by the Government at the instance of this House. I do not wish to go into the merits of the question. It is after all a small matter but there is a question of principle involved, namely, whether we could find fault with anybody created by ourselves, and vested with definite powers under the statute, so long as that body is acting within such powers. It is no use creating a body with statutory powers and then expecting such an autonomous body to act under our orders. It has been suggested that there might have been greater courtesy shown. Well, courtesy is a reciprocal duty. There is no need to fret over it. If the language employed leads to misunderstandings, the proper remedy is not to attack the University in this House but settle it by mutual adjustments. My hon. Friend Mr. Etirajulu Nayudu tabled certain questions. In my opinion, they really raised a very fundamental issue. One of the questions asked is, who scrutinizes the work of the Professor of History. In a University the Professors are supposed to be, whether they are or are not is quite a different matter, they are supposed to be authorities in their own subjects. Who then is to scrutinize the work of the Professor? I simply do not know. If the Legislative Council wishes to undertake that task, I wish them joy. Personally I will have nothing to do with such an inquisition. It was also asked what books he published and whether owing to any special permission he appropriated the profits. Is the University to pry into the private affairs of its professors? I do think that the question was not happily put. If there have been misunderstandings between Government and University, I hope my hon. Friend the Education Minister will proceed with caution and display the same qualities which he expects the University to display. The University is an autonomous body as stated by Dr. Subbarayan. I am sorry I have not got the quotation here, but I distinctly remember Lord Bryce saying that Government should not interfere with the internal working of the University even if it receives a grant. Even when grants are given for some specific purposes, as far as possible they should be of the nature of grants to be expended by the University at its own discretion. The reason for it seems to be simple as well as convincing. After all, the University, whether it is so or

4-30 p.m.

not in fact—I am not saying anything more—is the most intellectual body. It is composed of intellectuals, and the professors there are authorities on the subjects concerned, and by giving lump grants and leaving it to them to spend at their discretion, it would secure better results than by directing the expenditure itself by detailed rules and regulations. That is one side of the question which ought not to be lost sight of. And lastly, on this point of autonomy, when you once invest a body with statutory powers you must have confidence in that body—a good deal depends on confidence—so long as it keeps within its powers. If it goes beyond, you are bound to interfere with it. If it keeps within its powers, anything in the nature of an authoritative interference should be most carefully avoided. My hon. Friend referred to matters which are relatively of far more importance than these

22nd March 1922]

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

things, namely, the reconstruction of the University. The University is at one with the Government in thinking that its constitution should be renovated. Resolutions were passed by the Senate over a year ago on the subject. It now rests with the Government to take steps to reconstitute the University on a more modern and democratic basis. No one connected with the University will say that the present constitution is the best possible. We do want it to be renovated. The University, the Senate and the Syndicate have not stood in the way of the Government in this matter. The sooner the Government moves in the matter the better will it be, and nobody will be more pleased than the University itself."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—" I want to emphasize one or two points that have arisen in connexion with this debate. The constitutional aspect of the matter has been placed before this Council by the Member for the University, and I would like to invite the attention of this Council to the fact that some years ago the Government of India gave a recurring grant of Rs. 65,000 which was handed over to the University for very definite and specific purposes. And one of these purposes was the creation of a University professorship in Indian History and Archæology on a salary of Rs. 500—50—1,000 per month. That, Sir, is the outstanding fact that I would like to place before the Council before it proceeds to vote upon this question. Before the Reforms scheme came into force this grant was not made by the Local Government; it was a grant made by the Government of India. The Local Government was merely the channel through which that grant passed. And the specific object that has aroused a certain amount of discussion in this Council is one which is included in the specific allotment of Rs. 65,000. I now ask this Council to accept the moral responsibility that is laid upon it by the Reforms scheme. That moral responsibility comes in wherever the Government of India formerly paid a grant for a specific purpose to a definitely constituted body—in this particular case it is a statutory body—whether it be a local body or whether it be a University; I ask this Council to assume the responsibility that rightly devolves upon it under the Reforms scheme and accept the moral obligation under which it has to continue the payment of Rs. 65,000, which includes the pay of the professor of Archæology. That, Sir, is the financial aspect of the question.

" I should like the Council further to bear in mind, before it comes to a decision upon this matter, that as the Member for the University has told us, the reconstruction of the University is on the anvil, and I trust that before the next budget is taken up a definite decision will have been arrived at in the proposal to put the University on a different footing from what it is at present. The Government has a very large control over the University, almost complete control, but, as already pointed out, that control should be exercised in general and not in minute details upon which it is very doubtful whether this Council is a sufficiently experienced body to exercise that control."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" Before the hon. the Minister rises, may I ask one question, namely, whether the view given expression to as to moral responsibility without being entitled to ask how the money is being applied is a position which the Minister accepts the responsibility of?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATIL :—" It is true that the grant was first given by the Government of India. But since April 1921 it is a provincial grant and is charged on the provincial funds. Therefore this Government

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[22nd March 1922]

makes direct grants now to the University of the amounts specified in the resolution. The original object, when the Government grant of Rs. 65,000 was given by the Government of India, was this. But it is now allocated by the University changing altogether the specific objects and aims with which the Government of India gave this grant of Rs. 65,000. Therefore the responsibility of examining the present allocation falls upon this Government. This Government and this House which has voted this allotment have a right to question how the allotment has been expended and whether the instructions of the Government when making the grant have been carried out. (Hear, hear.) The original allocation was Rs. 6,000 for a librarian, additional libraries and staff, and cost of publication; Rs. 4,500 for special lectures; Rs. 12,000 for a professor of Indian History and Archæology; Rs. 6,000 for the development of the study of South Indian languages and other contingencies. Now it is modified and re-allotted like this: Librarian: as against Rs. 6,000, it is Rs. 1,765; additional library and cost of publication: as against Rs. 4,500, it is Rs. 3,500. The original sum of Rs. 12,000 which was intended for special lectures for the benefit of the post-graduate students of the University has been reduced to Rs. 3,788; professor of Indian History: from Rs. 6,000, it has been altered to Rs. 14,000; development and study of South Indian languages and other contingencies: from Rs. 6,500, it has now been altered to Rs. 7,848; professor of Economics: Rs. 30,000; and Tamil lexicon: Rs. 25,000. Thus the House will see that the whole allotment has been changed by the University as it pleased. Just as in the case of any other local body or corporation, constituted by the Legislature, it has a right to ask how the grants that have been given have been expended. It is true, as my hon. Friend Mr. Reddi said, it is an autonomous body. The word 'autonomous' has been defined subsequently. If the House will read the Saddler Commission's report it will see how far the Government is entitled to control the allocation of funds granted by it."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Does the hon. the Minister mean that the Government can sit in judgment over the University which is a corporate body?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"The Government, when it contributes funds, has the right to call for an explanation as to how those funds are utilised. I do not want to enter into the academical discussion of the question whether the University is an autonomous body and how far the Government has got control over it. My position is this: So far as the budget allotment is concerned, that allotment has been made by the Government with specific instructions. Government has got a right to ask whether the specific instructions have been carried out or not. We are not discussing an ideal state of things. We are discussing their practical aspect. The point is that we have to apply the rules and procedure as they exist, not as they ought to be."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Does the hon. the Minister mean in these specific instances that this Legislature can sit in judgment over the work of the professor of Indian History?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I have said already the Government made the grant; the Government has got the right to call for information; and this Legislature which votes the money has also the right to call for explanation. Therefore speaking on the budget, I will only say that

22nd March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

the amount having been granted by the Government, and that amount having been modified, changed and altered afterwards by the University, the Government has a right to call for information. I do not say anything definitely as to what are the different powers of the University, and how it should be constituted. All this I am sure will come up when I prepare the University Bill for which I am gathering materials, and, as observed by the Director, we are at work collecting information from all sides. It will be discussed in this House when the Bill is ready. But we are concerned with the practical side of the question, and we are constrained as a business body, as a legislative body, as a responsible Government, to demand whether, if we make a grant of a certain amount to a body constituted by the Legislature, we have got the power to question how it is spent. There is no academical discussion of the powers of the University under the Act. Here are the rules, here are the specific purposes for which this money is to be devoted. The whole question is whether the objects have been carried out or not. If the purposes have not been defined, no doubt it is entirely within the discretion of the University to dispose of the grant as it likes.

“Now, as for the reduction, I am not at all in favour of the motion. I oppose the motion, and I hope that my hon. Friend will not press the motion further.”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“I have listened to the speeches of the hon. the Minister and the Member for the University, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, who is driven to such straits that he has to pluck up courage and plead that he is inferior to the other candidate. This, however, is a small matter. In regard to the main question of the propriety of the answer which has been vouchsafed by the University, I join issue with him. He is unfortunately in the position of a lawyer, which is not his usual profession, of defending the University against the attacks made on it in virtue of his position as its representative here. No doubt it is an autonomous institution, and according to the rules of the West, whatever it does there should be no interference with it. But to ask for information as to what is being done with the money that has been received by the gentleman who received it, is certainly not interfering with it.

“If, for instance, the Minister or this House, or any other person sent a requisition to that gentleman asking him to deliver lectures on ‘Kangaroos’ in the ‘Island of New Zealand’ instead of lecturing on anything to be found in the Madras Presidency or in India, he would not be justified in doing so. But to ask what he has been doing for the last eight years, and to let us have some information is not interfering with the internal administration of the University. I am very glad that the hon. the Minister has not chosen to express his approval of the dictum which the hon. Mr. Littlehales has laid down, i.e., regarding the moral responsibility which lay upon this House or the successor of the former administration for continuing this grant which was instituted by the Government of India in the pre-Reform days. I suppose what he meant was that we are but the trustees for the application of this money, that the Government of India is the donor, and that the University is the beneficiary. I suppose he knows also that the trustee has a duty to find out whether the money entrusted to him for a particular purpose is being properly applied, and if not, whether he is not guilty of breach of trust, and therefore—”

4-45 p.m.

[22nd March 1922]

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ But surely the reports of the Syndicate contain information on the work of the particular professor.”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ May I point out, Sir, that to collect this information from these books is like tracing a needle in a haystack. This is not the kind of information that we want. The University is giving this information in the form of a report of its working year after year to its *alumni*. To come to my point, we would certainly be guilty of breach of trust if we did not inquire how this money has been applied, whether it has been properly applied, whether the person who is receiving this money is efficiently carrying on his work of investigation and original research year after year. Under these circumstances, I submit we are perfectly entitled to call for any information, and to withhold the grant allotted to the University, if it does not render a proper account of the money which it has received. It is only a question of giving information and of accounting for money received, whether the money has been properly applied, and if we ask for such information it is not interfering with the internal administration of the University or with any University regulation such as that every lecturer shall deliver so many lectures during the year, and so on. However, having regard to the assurance given by the hon. the Minister that he has before him the question of the reconstruction of the University, and as I hope that a more reasonable spirit will prevail in the University after this discussion, I beg, Sir, with your permission, to withdraw this motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 520 to 523.

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

520. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 85,500 for grants to University by Rs. 12,000.*

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

521. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 85,500 for grants to University by Rs. 100.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

522. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 85,500 for grants to University by Rs. 12,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

523. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,98,876 for Government Arts Colleges by Rs. 1,000.*

Motion 524.

Mr. S. ARUPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

524. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,46,800 by Rs. 20,000.*

“ My object in moving this motion is to enforce this principle, i.e., that Government professional institutions should be as much as possible run on economic lines and not prove a great burden on the Indian tax-payer. Now this grant refers to the College of Engineering, and I find, Sir, that this

22nd March 1922] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

institution costs the Indian tax-payer something like Rs. 1,71,250. I had occasion to remark that the state of things revealed by the report was, to say the least, nothing short of a scandal. Now this institution has been run with nearly 2/3rds, nay 3/4ths, as the report itself admits, of the senior staff absent. That is what we read on page 11. There were three professors who were not working the whole year, i.e., the Principal, Mr. Barker, who resigned, the professor of Civil Engineering, the professor of Mechanical Engineering, and the post of professor of Technical Chemistry remained vacant, and the Director of Public Instruction in his remarks at the end of the report says that 'the results of the several examinations held during the year were very fair.' The Director notes with pleasure that 'the college has maintained a state of general efficiency during the year.'

"Sir, my contention is that if it was possible for the institution to maintain its efficiency even while 3/4ths of the senior staff were absent on leave, it should be possible, I think, to run that institution more cheaply, and to lighten the burden which falls on the Indian tax-payer. I think the House will do well to enforce this maxim, i.e., that at least 50 per cent of the charges should be met either from fees or from other sources of income; otherwise institutions of this nature would certainly be a burden on the tax-payer who does not derive any immediate benefit from them."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"These are professional colleges and special qualifications are necessary for a professor to be able to lecture to his pupils. As regards mechanical engineering and technical chemistry, for the last six months we have been asking for a suitable candidate. With regard to mechanical engineering there are certain names before us, and we are considering whether the qualifications of the two candidates that are now before us are sufficient for lecturing on mechanical engineering. The whole system, as I said at the beginning of my general remarks, must be altered before this House can charge the Member or the Minister. When we want a certain professor with a specific qualification, we intimate our requirements to the Secretary of State. The High Commissioner advertises for this purpose and from the list prepared in the office of the Secretary of State he sends down a candidate to Madras. The candidate he thus sends down to us we are obliged to take. We have complained with reference to the way in which the Secretary of State deals with us. It is the system that is responsible for this. So this system has to be altered before this House asks us to say why these places have been kept vacant. I do not specifically refer to the recent instances in the Engineering College or the Presidency College where we wanted a certain candidate with special qualifications, and when the candidate came down, instead of being specially fit for the required subject he was found fit for another subject. Even under such circumstances we find it very difficult not to take him at the time when he actually arrives and especially when an engagement has been entered into with him. Therefore it is not this Government that is to blame, but it is the system under which this Government is working. It is for this House to alter that system, and when that is done the result which the hon. Mover has in view can very easily be achieved."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR:—"I hope the hon. the Minister will do his very best to change the system, and if the system is changed certainly our objects can be achieved. I beg therefore to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[22nd March 1922]

Motion 525.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

525. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,47,238 by Rs. 3,000.

“ My object in making this motion is to have one piece of information either from the hon. the Minister for Education or from the Director of Public Instruction. Is it not possible to run the Teachers' College more economically by showing greater saving if some system could be devised for increasing the fees to be paid by students attending the practical section? For, I find that this institution costs nearly Rs. 59,148, and the charge under provincial revenue is Rs. 57,937. If the hon. the Minister or the Director of Public Instruction will give me an assurance that by raising the fees or by reducing the staff, if necessary, some saving will be made I shall be satisfied. I only raise this point on a question of principle. It is possible to raise the fees by about 40 or 50 per cent.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ As regards the increase of the fees of candidates, hon. Members already know that the candidates find it very difficult to pay even the fees now current. If you increase the fees they will ask for increased stipends, with the result that we shall have to pay more than what we are now paying. So that I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that if we reduce the grant in one way they will increase the charges in another way.

“ As regards the reduction of the staff, recently Government received proposals from the head of the department for the appointment of one or two additional lecturers owing to the increasing strength of the institution. Therefore it is not possible at present to reduce the staff, nor, as I showed, is it possible to reduce the expenditure by raising the fees. However, as this question has been raised, I am sure to look into the matter in detail.”

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“ May I ask whether the fees of the students attending the practical section of the Teachers' College cannot be raised ? ”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ If the fees are raised there will be, I fear, a fall in the strength of the college, because the students may go to other institutions where the fees are lower. However, I shall see if it is possible to raise the fees in areas where there are no similar institutions for the candidates to go to.”

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“ I beg to withdraw my motion, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 526.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—“ Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

526. To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,400 for L. T. section for women.

“ Sir, I find that this is the first time the Government have come to us for a grant for this purpose. I have only one or two words to mention in this connexion. There is already a college existing where training is given for women

22nd March 1922]

[Mr. P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu]

graduates. I find from the budget estimate that this amount of Rs. 14,400 is required for two lecturers costing Rs. 4,800 plus Rs. 1,200 as teaching allowance; stipends to the extent of Rs. 3,200; and the rest for contingencies, establishment, etc. Why so much as Rs. 4,000 is required for contingencies when the teaching staff alone is provided Rs. 4,800, I should like to know. Besides, in every mufassal station in every district there are schools for training teachers, and there are no separate schools for women. That being the case, what is the extra necessity for opening a training section for women in the Presidency town? I can only say that so far as I know there are very few students who will be found to join, when the department is opened. I do not mean to say that a teaching department is not necessary, but all that I say is that it is not necessary just at present when there are very few students who will make use of the opportunity. As far as I know there are only a few students from Travancore and Cochin. How far it will be useful to this Presidency if these pupils are trained, I leave it to the House to judge.

“There is another point. Our province is very backward so far as university education among women is concerned. That shows that there will not be many students willing to undergo the training. I therefore suggest that this may be deferred for some time to come and it would be better to persuade the existing training colleges to train these women for the present. With these few words, I move my motion.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“Sir, I am really sorry that this motion has been tabled. That Mr. Etirajulu Nayudu of all persons, who is very keen on the expansion of female education and who has been in his own district trying his best in the matter, should try to curtail the expenditure on female education seems to be a matter for surprise. Considering the difficulties that now exist in Madras for the training of women, a new section is intended to be attached to the Queen Mary's College temporarily. When the matter was inquired into by the Director, all the difficulties were set forth, and the Government sanctioned a temporary scheme. In order to expand female education we must have teachers trained for the purpose. The hon. Mover referred to the fact that the need in the mufassal is greater than the need here in Madras City, as there is a training college here to which girls can go, and as girls have already been going to that college. It is true that there is a training college here to which the girls can go, but they are only going there with great inconvenience. There are no lady lecturers there nor are there boarding facilities in the Saidapet College. Therefore if there is a residential college like the Queen Mary's College and a training section is opened in that college, it will be more useful and more conducive to the progress of female education. We want teachers and without them we cannot get on, and this House should also examine the question raised by the hon. Mover, that is, while concentrating our attention on the City of Madras, we must not neglect the question of the organization of education in the mufassal. My own impression, after visiting several places, has been that the training schools in the mufassal are not up to the mark and therefore it is desirable that we should place a well-trained superintendent to go round and give them new life and vigour. Without therefore necessarily saying that we would deprive the city of the benefits of a special training institution, I may assure my hon. Friend that we shall also pay attention to the mufassal and hope therefore that he will not press his motion.”

[22nd March 1922]

The Rev. W. MESTON :—“ Sir, I trust that this motion will not be pressed. One of my reasons for this hope may seem to be an indirect one. It is because I have been for the past two years pressing on missionary bodies the advisability of starting a college for the higher training of women teachers, a step which there is good reason to believe will soon be taken. My reason for urging the establishment of such a college is identical with that which leads me to support the maintenance of the grant on behalf of the L.T. class connected with Queen Mary's College, namely, the great need which exists in this Presidency for the provision of adequate facilities for the training of women graduates as teachers. My other reason is that the present method is a very satisfactory means of meeting that need. Having been appointed under the Universities Act to conduct the local inquiry required for the affiliation by the University of L.T. class in Queen Mary's College, I was able to see the conditions under which the training is carried on, and the benefits which the students derive from their teaching and life in that college.

“ Further it is to be noted that it is not only the city which benefits by this class. Though it exists in Madras the women who are trained in it will go out to various parts of the Presidency, so that the mufassal no less than the town will share in the educational advantages which this class will afford. And no one will deny that a large number of highly-trained women teachers is very much required. Indeed the need is so great that there is room for at least two such institutions. Ten years ago who would have thought that there would by this time be two degree colleges for women in Madras, each of them with over a hundred students? Let the facilities be given, and there is no doubt as to their being fully used.

“ I may also draw the attention of the House to the fact that the University of Madras, among its resolutions based on a consideration of the Calcutta University Commission report, recommended that the facilities for the training of women teachers should be increased, and the same position has been reached by a committee more recently appointed as a result of one of the resolutions before this Council. Besides, Sir, this class in Queen Mary's College is one which deals with the training of graduates, with those who are receiving instruction for the highest form of teaching; other classes and schools attend to those whose training is of the primary or secondary grade. By means of this class the whole of women's education is benefited down to its most elementary forms, as indeed has always proved the case when the highest forms of education have been properly dealt with. It is for reasons such as those which I have stated that I sincerely trust that this motion will be withdrawn.”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ Sir, Mr. President, I hope the hon. Minister will not accuse me of want of sympathy towards female education. But I might point out that, as he himself said, education must begin from the base and not from the top and that charity ought to begin at home. For, after all, we know in spite of there not being a special college for girls to train them for the L.T. degree they have been passing examinations all the time, which shows that they have had some facilities. But I think more facilities can be given by the Government in the way of scholarships and giving better encouragement to them than what they are now getting when they pass the examinations and apply for various situations in Government service. Sir, I may also say that when I spoke of

22nd March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

charity beginning at home so far as the need for the L.T. section is concerned, I was thinking of the fact that the section in the Queen Mary's College is providing vainly for our sisters in Malabar and Cochin. And I do not believe that there are any appreciable number of students coming from the Madras Presidency proper, which is under the administration of the British Government. So much so, that I put a question and I await information. Is it proposed to appoint as principal or professor a person who has had experience of this country and conditions of life here and who has had previous training, or is it only intended to fill it up by one of those persons of the Indian Educational Service system who have got out after recruitment made by the Secretary of State? The persons selected by the Secretary of State may be without any previous training, without any previous knowledge of the conditions of the country, and without any previous knowledge of the languages of the country and the various circumstances which go to make a good professor or principal. It is a consideration of all these things which would enable the House to say how they make up their minds in regard to this motion. I know, as I pointed out recently, several young women who have passed examinations but who have not unfortunately received that encouragement which we expect they should receive at the hands of the Government and their educational officers. For there is this distinction made between woman and woman, as there is a distinction made between one class of men and another class. Already there is a lot of discontent among men in this country as to the way in which they are treated. If to this you are going to add discontent, amongst educated girls, you will be adding to the miseries of the country. Therefore it is that while we allot money for education, we should so allot it and administer it that it may be a source of benefit and strength to the Government and not a source of dissatisfaction and discontent in the country."

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—"Sir, I was really very sorry that I was misunderstood by the hon. the Minister. I have every sympathy with the education of girls. I do not say that it is not at all necessary for all time to come to establish a training college and staff. But just now at the present moment when our funds are poor I have suggested that we should manage with the existing institutions. I may also say that this amount of Rs. 14,000 and odd may very usefully be spent in granting stipends and scholarships to students in Madras as well as mufassal. Anyhow, since I have heard the hon. the Minister say that he would look into this question carefully and scrutinize, I have no mind to press this motion further."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 527 and 528.

The following motions were not made :--

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :--

527. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,400 for L.T. section for women.*

MR. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :--

528. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,400 for L.T. section for women.*

[22nd March 1922]

Motion 529.

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

529. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,89,067 for Madras University by Rs. 100.*

“ Sir, my object in tabling this motion is to elicit information from the hon. the Minister for Education on a few points. One is whether the provision of about Rs. 16,000 includes the Government of India scholarships to students proceeding to England, I mean the one given by the University of Madras, and whether this item of money given hitherto by the Government of India has now been provincialized and is going to be paid by this Government. I hope, Sir, if such provision has not been made, that the hon. the Minister would see his way to make it by reappropriation or by some other means. I think it is very necessary that the Government should select capable young men who can be sent to Oxford or Cambridge or some other University where they can carry on research work for three or four years and can come back here to conduct research especially in the realm of science.

“ Secondly, I should like to know from the hon. the Minister for Education whether the Government would provide for a science block in the Queen Mary's College. These girls are now going for scientific instruction to the Presidency College. I know, Sir, that the Professor at the Presidency College has got a large number of men pupils to teach and so the girl pupils are given turns, especially as in science you have got experiments and demonstrations. And these lecturers have got to work overtime on Saturday also. There are two special assistants in the Presidency College in order to give these girls instruction in science. I think it would be better if the instruction is imparted at the Queen Mary's College itself. I understand that no provision for science block is made in the Queen Mary's College as there are no funds available. I hope, Sir, that the Council will be able to make the hon. the Minister see his way to provide a building for a science block in the Queen Mary's College.

“ Thirdly, I would like to touch one further point. Replying to the criticisms offered on education during the general budget discussion, the hon. the Minister said that his policy was national efficiency, and he quoted as an example of national efficiency the fact that once upon a time out of 42 appointments in the Indian Educational Service, 31 were held by Europeans and only 11 by Indians, and now there are 22 Indians and about 19 Europeans. He then turned round and asked the question whether this does not conduce to national efficiency. I for one answer, Sir, that it does not. I certainly think that Indianisation of the services is a very good thing and it is not because it will make for national efficiency but because we get men born in this country for a less sum than what we have to pay to the European. But as long as the European remains to serve in this country, I think it is the duty of the man who is in charge of the department to appreciate the work that the European members of the service are doing in this country (hear, hear). I for one admit, Sir, that the Europeans have done very well by this country. Of course, we are moving in different times and different times need different men, and it is because of that I want Indians in service. But that does not mean that the Indians in services make for national efficiency. It is merely because that we want our own

22nd March 1922]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

country men, and merely because that we will be helping the sons of the country to pursue the profession of education that we think Indians should replace Europeans.

“But it must be granted that as long as Europeans remain in service in this country, they ought to be made contented with their lot. The working of these reforms depends largely upon how we treat the services. I cannot concede, Sir, that replacement of Europeans by Indians is the setting up of a new system and the beginning of a new policy. What we want to work for, Sir, is to gradually organize education in such a manner that we shall have at least one primary school in each village and a secondary school at each taluk headquarters.”

5-15 p.m.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“I can only sympathize with the lack of information on the part of the hon. Member in not knowing how we have been able to found schools year after year in the villages. If he had taken the trouble to read the administration report of last year or the previous year, he would have found how rapidly elementary education has been progressing in this Presidency. And as to treatment of Europeans I yield to none in that respect and I fail to see any new theory in what my friend has enunciated in this House. No Indian politician or patriot will minimise the importance of the services that the Europeans have rendered to this country and I yield to none in my admiration and appreciation of those services. We want their sincere co-operation with us in carrying out the reforms successfully. I am sorry that Dr. Subbarayan, who has known me all these months, has not been able to appreciate this position; and I do not know whether I should put it to his discredit in not appreciating me or to my misfortune that he has not understood me. It is however unfortunate that he has raised this issue in the present case. I do not see any purpose, any principle, any object which is served in raising the question now.

“As regards the founding of a science school in the Queen Mary's College, I shall be very glad if the Finance Member or the Finance Secretary is able to find funds for me not only for this but for many other objects which I proposed. I had to struggle hard to get money for the chemistry expansion in the Presidency College and there are various other proposals; but as a matter of understanding with the Government no funds should be asked for this year owing to financial stringency for new works. That Dr. Subbarayan, though he was part of the Government at the time, at any rate in his capacity as a Council Secretary, and though he was aware of the conditions, should have made this statement passes my comprehension.

“Then, Sir, as regards scholarships for going to England, that also is a matter of finance. The Indian Government felt that it was quite convenient to put it on the Madras Government and the Madras Government is not better off than the Indian Government. If therefore there are funds we shall be able to attend to this also.

“Many useful and many desirable schemes and better schemes than any that have been raised in this debate have had to be laid aside for want of funds. If Dr. Subbarayan or his friends are able to find me funds I shall be very glad to utilise them for the purpose. It is very unfortunate that Dr. Subbarayan has raised this racial question at present in this debate, knowing as he does the financial position and I see no justification for it unless there be some motive.”

[22nd March 1922]

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Sir, I did not raise any racial question. I merely said that it is not national efficiency to replace Europeans by Indians. I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The Council adjourned at 5-25 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. on Thursday the 23rd March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

